FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

BIS-SOV-90-052
riday
6 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-052 *16 March 1990*

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Grinevskiy Cites Vienna Arms Talks Issues *[TASS]* 1
Council of Europe Discusses Role in E. Europe 1
Petrovskiy Meets Delegation *[TASS]* 1
Sager Gives Briefing *[TASS]* 2
Objectives, Tasks Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 2
Brussels European Security Debate Viewed *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 4
Yakovlev Meets European Commission Co-Chairman *[TASS]* 5
Adamishin Reviews First 'Four Plus Two' Meeting *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 6
Military Status of United Germany Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 6
UN Security Council Discusses Israel's Actions *[TASS]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Salutes Gorbachev on Election to Presidency *[TASS]* 8
Bush 'Looking Forward' to Meeting With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 8
Shevardnadze Receives U.S. Ambassador 15 Mar *[TASS]* 8
U.S.-Soviet Talks on Asia-Pacific Region End *[TASS]* 8
Bush, Congress Clash on Democracy Fund Predicted *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 8
Plans for New USSR-U.S. Air Routes Reported *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 9
Smuggled Duplicators Found Among Charity Freight *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 9

China

PRC Spokesman on Lithuania, Li Peng Visit *[Moscow International]* 10
Commentary on Soviet Delegation's Visit to PRC *[Moscow International]* 10
Kim Il-song, Jiang Zemin Meeting Reported *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 10

Northeast Asia

MPRP Central Committee Plenum Concludes Work 11
PRAVDA Reports Plenum Activities *[15 Mar]* 11
Former MPRP Leader Expelled *[TASS]* 11
Constitution To Be Revised *[TASS]* 12
Fourteen 'Released From Duties' *[TASS]* 12
Veteran on Soviet Combat Pilots in Korea in 1950 *[Moscow International]* 12
Kaifu's Approach To Developing Ties Welcomed *[Moscow International]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary on Reduced Soviet, U.S. Asia Presence
[Aleksandrov on Moscow International] 13
Cultural Cooperation Agreement With Philippines *[TASS]* 14
Burmese Economy Examined Before Elections *[Moscow International]* 14

Near East & South Asia

Vorontsov on 'Special Measures' Against Israel *[Kuwait KUNA 15 Mar]* 14
U.S. Blamed for Government Crisis in Israel *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 15
U.S. Involvement in Al-Rabitah Fire Questioned *[Grikov on Moscow International]* 15
U.S. Claims of Libyan Toxin Plant Reported *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 16

Bazoft Death Penalty 'Totally Unacceptable' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 16
Commentary Views Kurdistan Situation, Trials *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 17
Afghan Army Political Chief Cited on Situation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 17
Afghan Shiites' Conference Held in Tehran *[Moscow International]* 18
Nothing New in Bhutto Statement on Afghanistan *[TASS]* 18
Prospects After Afghan Coup Attempt Assessed *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 19
Islamic 'Fundamentalism' in Egypt Viewed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 21

Sub-Saharan Africa

Tanzanian Prime Minister Meets Soviet Delegation *[TASS]* 22
Mandela's Stockholm Statements Assessed *[Moscow International]* 22

East Europe

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Eastern Europe *[Moscow International]* 23
Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Polish Envoy *[TASS]* 24
Romanian Academic Cited on Economic Policy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Mar]* 24
Albanian Minister Calls for Balkan Cooperation *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 14 Mar]* 25

West Europe

Akhromeyev Queried; Discusses a Unified Germany *[East Berlin ADN]* 25
New Military Radio Program Features Germany *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Commentator Scrutinizes German Unification *[Moscow International]* 28
Representatives Exchange With Vatican Agreed *[TASS]* 28
Joint Venture With Italy Encounters Problems *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 28
UK Trade Minister Visits, Holds Meetings 29
Biryukova Receives Ridley 13 Mar *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 29
Sitaryan Speaks With Ridley *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Ridley Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 30
French Minister on Polish Border, German Unity *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Mar]* 30
Moscow Radio To Carry French 'Radio Nostalgie' *[TASS]* 31
NOVOYE VREMYA's Editor Departs for Paris *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 31
Soviet-Spanish Economic Commission Meets *[TASS]* 31

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze Congratulates New Uruguayan Minister *[TASS]* 31
Shevardnadze, Venezuela's Planchart Messages Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Chilean President Receives Gorbachev Message *[Moscow TV]* 32
New Chilean President Aylwin Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Mar]* 32
IZVESTIYA Reports Nicaraguan Amnesty Law *[13 Mar]* 33
'Enhanced' Vigilance Against Cuban Opposition *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 34
Arrest of Cuban Rights Activists Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 34
Oceanographic Survey Conducted With Cuba *[TASS]* 35
Fugitive Haitian Leader Flies to United States *[IZVESTIYA 14 Mar]* 35
PRAVDA Welcomes 'Glimmer of Hope' in Haiti *[13 Mar]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Holds News Conference 15 March *[Moscow TV]* 37
Presidential Powers Bill Survives Postponement *[TASS]* 44
Text of Law on Presidency *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 44
Reaction To Gorbachev Election Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 51
Gorbachev on Need for Supreme Soviet Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Congress Votes for Chairman *[TASS]* 52
Elects Lukyanov *[TASS]* 52
Further on Supreme Soviet Chairman Election *[Moscow TV]* 52

Moscow TV Carries Congress of People's Deputies 53
Discuss Supreme Soviet Chairman 53
Candidates Proposed 54
Merits of Candidates Debated 55
Sobchak's Qualities Discussed 56
On Lithuania's 'Rash' Move 57
Requires 'In Depth' Discussion 58
More on Lithuania's 'Pernicious' Move 58
Lithuanian Declaration 'Provacative' 59
Lukyanov Elected Chairman 60
Coverage of Gorbachev's News Conference Featured 60
Discusses Soviet Jewish Emigration *[TASS]* 60
Desires Arms Pact During U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 61
Confident of Improved PRC Relations *[TASS]* 61
On Military Reform, Modern Weapons *[TASS]* 61
Speaks on European Security Policy *[TASS]* 61
Congratulates Eastern Nations New Year *[TASS]* 62
Gorbachev Meets Yazov, Servicemen in Kremlin *[TASS]* 62
Congress Informed of Party Support for Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Martirosyan on Presidential Power Issue *[Moscow TV]* 62
Congress Approves Presidency Amendment *[Moscow TV]* 63
Congress Debate on Presidency Issue Reported *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 63
Discusses Presidential Powers *[TASS]* 64
Discusses Election of President *[Moscow TV]* 64
Further on Debates on Post of President *[TASS]* 66
Vlasov Defends Election of President by Congress *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 66
Congress Draft Resolution on Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 67
Gorbachev Speaks on Lithuania *[TASS]* 68
Majority Adopts Resolution *[TASS]* 69
Nishanov Reads Rejection of Lithuanian Decisions *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Medvedev Opposes 'Trifling' points of Order *[Moscow TV]* 69
Deputy's Proposal to 'Save Time' Rejected *[Moscow TV]* 70
Deputies Explain Their Vote on Congress Agenda *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 70
Aims of Soyuz Deputies' Group Explained *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 71
Congress of People's Deputies Concludes Work *[Moscow TV]* 72

Political & Social

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Resumes *[TASS]* 72
Offical Says Gorbachev Will Rule Democratically *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 72
Gerasimov on President Gorbachev's Election *[Tokyo TV]* 72
TASS Supplies Lukyanov Biography 74
Trade Body Linked With Moscow Criminal Gang *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Voters Warned of Consequences of 'Apathy' *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 75
Results of Poll on Attitudes to Land Ownership *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 76
Republic Election Day Activity Reported *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 77
NEW TIMES Views Press Difficulties *[No 9]* 79
Introduction of Multiparty System Discussed *[NEW TIMES No 8]* 82
Vorontsov on Jewish Emigration to Israel *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* 84
Figures for Crime Against Militia Disclosed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Mar]* 84

Economic

State Insurance Body Claims Rival is Illegal *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 85
Report on Examination of Cooperative Enterprises *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 85
No Radical Change in Industrial Statistics *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 88
Exhibition Promotes Aircraft Engine Exports *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 89

Scientific

Review of Fifth Space Expedition To Mir *[TASS]* 90

Laverov Outlines Reformed Science Policy *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 90
Deputy Minister on Aircraft Engine Sales *[Moscow TV]* 92
Academician Describes Tokamak-15 Fusion Device *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 92
Official Denies Rovno Nuclear Station Leak *[TRUD 12 Mar]* 93

Military

Military Chief Discusses Armed Forces Manning *[TASS]* 94
Yazov, Military Chiefs Meet on Draft Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 94
Kiev Military District Forces Begin Exercise *[TASS]* 94

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Official Discusses End of Military Commissariats *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Official Criticizes Decision *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Brazauskas Discusses Congress, Gorbachev Meeting *[Vilnius International]* 96
Landsbergis Cables Congratulations to Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 96
Minister Congratulates Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 96
Formation of Commission on Independence Issues *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 27 Feb]* 97
List of Members *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA]* 97
Lithuanian Party Responds to Gorbachev Reaction *[Moscow International]* 98
Autonomous Lithuanian Komsomol Congress Held *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 99
Report on Lithuanian Party Bureau Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 20 Feb]* 100
Party Official Interviewed on Lithuanian Issues *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 21 Feb]* 101
Reporter Reviews New Lithuanian Media Law *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 2 Mar]* 102
Estonian Supreme Soviet Concludes Session *[Moscow Radio]* 103
Results of Session *[Tallinn Radio]* 103
Republic Question Discussed *[Tallinn Radio]* 103
Estonia Issues Resolution on Independence *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 25 Feb]* 104
Gorbachev's Attitude to Baltic Issue Discussed *[Riga International]* 104
Report on Statistics for Latvian Candidates *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 27 Feb]* 105

Caucasus

Armenian, Azerbaijani Rayon Officials Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 106
Armenian Supreme Soviet Warns of Village Evictions *[Yerevan ARMENPRES]* 106

Grinevskiy Cites Vienna Arms Talks Issues

LD1503184590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Vienna, 15 March (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov reports: To include the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe on the canvas of the rapidly changing situation in Europe and to make sure that they keep pace with the positive changes on the continent—this is one of the main tasks of the present stage of this forum, the sixth round of which began today in the Austrian capital. In the halls of the majestic Hofburg Castle, where the meetings are being held, the necessity is being more acutely felt of reducing to a minimum the time spent on a general exchange of opinions and of increasing the efficiency of the working groups so that the basic efforts to find solutions to still unresolved questions should be concentrated in them.

However, local political observers consider that it is not just a question of speeding up the pace of the talks as much as possible. It is no less important to seek and find adequate political solutions to key problems. Ottawa is an example of this; a radical solution was found there to the problem of Soviet and U.S. troops outside the boundaries of their national territories in Europe. In accordance with this the United States and the USSR will each not have more than 195,000 ground and air force personnel on foreign soil in Central Europe. Apart from this, the Americans have undertaken not to station more than 30,000 servicemen outside the central part of the continent.

By the way, some of the mass media and even some politicians have tried to depict the above mentioned "30,000" as yet another concession by the Warsaw Pact. At the same time—this idea has been expressed in the American press—it cannot be ruled out that during the process of the drawing together of the two German states the question will be raised of the withdrawal from a united Germany of the troops of the USSR and the United States and the latter, in accordance with the Ottawa accord, should be taken away across the ocean. In this case the United States will be able to have only 30,000 servicemen in Europe.

The theme of the reduction of the size of the armed forces and armaments of the two alliances in central Europe is now the most complicated and urgent, according to O.A. Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation at the talks and ambassador at large, in a conversation with a TASS correspondent. The question inevitably arises of linking the military-political status of a united Germany, on which understanding must be reached at talks held on a "two plus four" basis, including, of course, questions concerning the size of its armed forces, with the context of the talks being held in Vienna on conventional armed forces in Europe. As far as the Vienna forum is concerned, he continued, there is now every chance of beginning, on the basis of the Ottawa accord, to draw up in the form of a treaty the agreed position on reducing the number of Soviet and U.S. troops stationed outside the boundaries of national territories in Europe. If we consider the aircraft issue, the advance in the Warsaw Pact's position in fixing the maximum levels for frontline tactical aircraft at 4,700 units, including medium bombers, and also the establishment of the sub-levels for air defense fighters at 1,500 units and for combat training aircraft at 1,500-1,600 units show that all possible steps have been taken by us. Clearly, the other side must make an effort to see that the aircraft issue does not become a stumbling block in the way of achieving accords this year.

Additionally, the Soviet diplomat noted, it is necessary to complete the work on the definitions of tanks and also to impose limitations on all the main kinds of armored vehicles, bearing in mind the structure of their fleets that has developed in the Warsaw Pact and NATO. We are close to an accord on combat helicopters, and this can be drawn up quite quickly so long as the provisions of the mandate on excluding naval components from the subject of the talks are observed. It is also time, at last, to resolve the question of artillery levels. Completion of the work on definitions of all these categories would make it possible to cast into a ready mold a large block of the future treaty, and to confirm thereby the seriousness of the intentions to complete the talks within the appointed time frame, before the end of the year, O.A. Grinevskiy emphasized.

The sixth session of the talks on confidence-building and security measures will begin on 19 March.

Council of Europe Discusses Role in E. Europe

Petrovskiy Meets Delegation

LD1503111890 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy met on Tuesday a visiting delegation from the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe (CE). The delegation is from the CE committee for relations with European non-member countries.

The Soviet deputy minister stressed that the Council of Europe was called upon to become one of the pillars of a future common European home.

It was noted with satisfaction that the CE Council of Ministers decided to agree to Soviet membership in seven European conventions in the fields of law, ecology, medicine, sport and the protection of architectural and archaeological heritage.

In this connection readiness was expressed to hold talks on specific aspects of Soviet membership in all other conventions. This is especially important to the Soviet Union during perestroyka, the Soviet deputy minister said.

There is no sense in inventing the wheel at a time when it is possible to make use of high European standards, which are the common wealth of all the peoples inhabiting the continent, naturally taking into account national specifics of one or another country, the deputy minister noted.

Petrovskiy reiterated the Soviet Union's readiness to participate in the work of the CE Council of Foreign Ministers on a permanent basis.

"We are looking forward to our relationship with the Council of Europe with optimism and are prepared to move ahead aiming at full membership in this organization," he said.

Sager Gives Briefing

LD1503104790 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Useful and encouraging were the words used by Peter Sager, chairman of the committee for relations with non-member countries of the Council of Europe, to describe discussions he and other members of the parliamentary assembly's delegation held in Moscow.

Peter Sager told a news conference here today, "We want to contribute to the development of East-West relations, the construction of a common European home and the resolution of problems of concern to countries on our continent."

The committee delegation arrived in Moscow last week to hold its session here and discuss the role parliaments and the public have to play during this turbulent period in East Europe.

During the days spent in Moscow, delegation members met Soviet people's deputies, Foreign Ministry and other officials. This morning they met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy.

Summing up the results of this meeting, delegation member Davis Atkinson of Great Britain said the Soviet Union regarded the Council of Europe as the main instrument to overcome the division on the continent and expressed the desire to join the organisation.

The Soviet Union, Atkinson said, is striving to meet the basic conditions for joining the Council—pluralist parliamentary democracy, legality and respect for human rights. Democratic changes in the Soviet Union, he noted, facilitate moving up its entry into the Council of Europe (CE). The CE Council of Foreign Ministers, he added, has already agreed to Soviet membership in seven European conventions in the fields of law, ecology, medicine, sport and the protection of architectural and archaeological heritage.

Delegation member Raymond Forni of France said that the Council of Europe is currently considering granting "specially invited" status to a number of East European countries, but noted that it was a lengthy process. Nevertheless, he stressed, the entry of these countries into the Council of Europe would facilitate the expansion of European cooperation and the progress of the Helsinki process on the continent.

Objectives, Tasks Viewed

90UI0413A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Morning p 5

[Article by Yu. Kovalenko, IZVESTIYA correspondent, Strasbourg: "The Cornerstone of the European House"]

[Text] Joao de Deus Pinheiro, the chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, and Catherine Lalumiere, the general secretary of the council, are coming to Moscow on a working visit. This correspondence from Strasbourg talks about the activity of the Council of Europe, about its objectives and tasks, and about the prospects for the cooperation of our country with this organization.

A half year has passed since M.S. Gorbachev spoke to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) in Strasbourg. In his speech, he outlined the main directions of European cooperation, and he emphasized: Now it is a question of the kind of perestroyka of the international order which took root on the old continent that would bring common European values decisively to the forefront, and that would make it possible to replace the traditional balance of forces with a balance of interests.

The Soviet leader's program was met by the parliamentarians with exceptional attention. "Let us take on this work together!" Anders Bjork, PACE chairman, proposed after the speech. Then, in an interview with IZVESTIYA correspondents, he declared: It is precisely the Council of Europe that can become the cornerstone of the European house.

Is the Council of Europe, which M.S. Gorbachev called one of the epicenters of European policy and the European idea, ready to take part in this construction, which is calculated for many years?

As a reminder: Created in 1949, the Council of Europe consists of 23 states, it is the most representative organization of the old continent, and it is involved in humanitarian and scientific and technical cooperation and human rights. It also makes a contribution to integrational processes, and it coordinates its activity with the European Economic Community to an increasing degree.

But up until now, the Council of Europe has remained, as it is sometimes called, "Club 23," with its own rules and regulations, which, of course, restricted its activity only to the western part of our continent. And this, naturally, is understood in the headquarters of the organization. We are open to the development of ties with East Europe, A. Bjork, who visited the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland last year, repeats insistently.

Indeed, the Council of Europe reacted quickly to the transformations that were taking place in socialist countries, and it expressed a readiness to arrange cooperation with them. The aspiration proved to be mutual—in the

middle of November of last year, the first socialist country, Hungary, applied for acceptance in the organization officially.

A new phase is beginning in the history of the organization, the Paris press noted. Now, it is expected that Hungary's example will be followed by Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. In the meantime, they, like the Soviet Union also, have the status of "specially invited" states.

The Council of Europe itself ties its own tomorrow to cooperation with socialist states. "I will strive to carry out reforms that will also affect our methods of work, and the activity itself," Catherine Lalumiere, the general secretary of the Council of Europe, explains to me. "I am paying special attention to the development of a dialogue with the countries of East Europe. Great events are occurring there, a real revolution. We are paying extreme attention to them, and we are offering as much assistance as possible. Our organization should promote overcoming the division of Europe and the unification of all forces—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Commenting on the proposal of F. Mitterand concerning the formation of a "European confederation" that would be joined by countries of the East and the West of our continent, Catherine Lalumiere declared that the Council of Europe could be its foundation. There is no need, she noted, to create new structures for this, because they already exist: The Council of Europe has everything that is needed for this. Its members, Catherine Lalumiere points out, are all West European countries, and East European countries will gradually join it.

"The Soviet Union," C. Lalumiere continues, "is an extremely important partner for us. And we are happy that M.S. Gorbachev chose specifically our organization as a tribunal for setting forth his concept of the future architecture of Europe. We established the first contacts with the USSR. Soviet delegates now participate in the work of PACE and in its various commissions. A special group was created that has met in Strasbourg and Moscow for the study of possible spheres of cooperation. There is the question now of the Soviet Union's joining several of our conventions—on ecology, culture, education, and television transmissions."

Joining the conventions means that the state, on the one hand, assumes certain specific obligations, and, on the other hand, that it gains an opportunity to become connected with international cooperation and to extract considerable benefit from this.

A convention is not simply an agreement that contains a certain number of articles or a standard code; it is first and foremost a legal basis and an instrument of cooperation whose scope is strictly defined, and it is its starting point. Thus, for example, the cultural convention of the Council of Europe helped the development of new methods of teaching foreign languages, the conduct of exhibits and festivals, and the offering of grants to teachers, etc.

The conventions of the Council of Europe, and more than 130 of them have been adopted, equivalent to about 2,500 bilateral agreements, in many ways determine the structure of European cooperation. Unfortunately, this structure was created without our participation. At the same time, the status of a "special invitee" gives us an opportunity to participate in international instruments that have already been approved and and that are being developed concerning—for example, the legal aspects of new spheres of science, such as genetic engineering.

Documents like these are also a reliable legal basis of the future all-European house. We are now conducting our domestic legislation in accordance with international standards, and here we can use the enormous experience of the Council of Europe in the sphere of civil, administrative, and criminal law, problems of preventing crime, and in the resolution of an entire complex of questions associated with the functioning of a rule-of-law state. "We are ready," Hans Peter Furrer [name as published], the director of the political department of the Council of Europe, tells me, "to invite Soviet specialists and to place our experts at your disposal."

The joint activity with the Council of Europe will help in the creation of a European rule-of-law space—a proposal that the USSR and France, supported by a number of other states, put forth at the Paris forum on humanitarian questions in the summer of 1989. And here a task that is important is the harmonization of European legislation. For this, it is necessary to exchange information, to conduct joint research, and to implement the Soviet idea of creating a European institute on comparative legislation in the humanitarian sphere.

On the whole, in the rule-of-law sphere, Eric Kharremos [name as published], director of the legal department of the Council of Europe, explained to me, we are pursuing three objectives: We are establishing an infrastructure for cooperation, we are checking to see to it that European legislation does not lag social development and scientific-technical progress, and we are working on legal norms in those areas where they do not yet exist.

The headquarters of the Council of Europe is also for setting up a dialogue with the Soviet Union on human rights. "Initially, the approaches of the West to the East on these problems were absolutely different," remarked Catherine Lalumiere. "In Western democracies, individual rights prevail over collective rights, and civil and political rights have priority over socio-economic rights. The opposite phenomenon was observed in East Europe until recent times. And here everyone, moving to meet each other, must disregard a part of his own way. In my opinion, you must broaden civil-political rights and we, in the West, to some degree have to examine our concept, taking into account collective and socio- economic rights. In addition, there can be no question that we should be giving you some kinds of lessons. Indeed, the West does not have any miraculous formulas."

A meeting with participation by representatives of the Council of Europe and the Soviet Union, which it is supposed will be conducted this year, will be devoted to human rights. And if our country decides to join this organization, then one of the conditions is the signing of a European convention on human rights and adherence to the requirements it contains, including monitoring procedures.

How will the relations between the Council of Europe and our country be coordinated in the future? Here, a lot depends on the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 23 member countries that manages its activity on a political level. In the near future, it must determine the main directions of the kind of cooperation in which both sides are interested and which, in the final analysis, should lead to the enrollment of the socialist countries in "Club 23."

"From the moment of its creation, our organization was thought of as all-European," Heinrich Klebes, one of the managers of its secretariat, emphasizes. "However, the division of the continent prevented this. Now, a new page is opening up in the history of the Council of Europe. We must examine everything that we have done over the course of 40 years, proceeding from the perspective of an all-European process. This, of course, also concerns the cultural sphere, where big gaps existed here for the lack of East European states in our ranks. Now their participation will make it possible to expand such programs as the preservation of cultural heritage, and the affirmation of European distinctiveness, to which the organization attaches special significance. It is possible that it is the European cultural convention that the Soviet Union will join first of all."

Contacts can be developed in various spheres. A number of proposals, put forth by M.S. Gorbachev in the speech in Strasbourg, received a positive response in the Council of Europe. As an example, I will name the development of a long-term program for environmental protection. I think that the Council of Europe could also join in the creation of a European agency for urgent ecological assistance and an all-European Institute of Ecological Research and Expert Analysis.

The Soviet delegation that visited Strasbourg last year affirmed the readiness of our country to join the Open Partial Protocol on Preventing Major Natural and Technological Catastrophes. It is exactly in this sphere that there is a possibility of cooperation of the international Institute of the Theory of Earthquake Forecasting, created by the USSR Academy of Sciences, and eight scientific West European centers that are operating within the framework of the Open Partial Protocol, which engages in these problems.

Thus, a successful start has been given to the development of our relations with the Council of Europe. For the time being, the first steps have been taken, and the Soviet side, as I was told in Strasbourg, is being very active. However, it is hardly the time to anticipate and to try to predict the date of the Soviet Union's entry into this organization. At the same time, the participation now of the socialist countries is transforming the Council of Europe into a unique forum for all-European cooperation and into one of the main instruments for executing the Vienna and Helsinki accords. And, today, it is believed in the Alsace capital that all of the prerequisites exist so that it would really become the "cornerstone" of the common European house.

Brussels European Security Debate Viewed

PM1503135590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Peresada dispatch under the rubric "East-West: Political Dialogue": "Europe Not Field of Conflicts"]

[Text] Brussels, Mar—Whichever newspaper you open here now—be it ours, Belgian, French, or British—the international section is invariably dominated by the theme of Europe. The interest in it is understandable—it has been heightened by the turbulent events in the east of the continent. But the characteristic feature of recent days has been that the stream of information on the changes in the East European countries is increasingly giving way to analytical reflections on how the future of Europe as a whole may shape up in the new conditions.

This problem formed the theme of a meeting here between representatives of Eastern and Western political and social forces sponsored by the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation. Delegations from 20 countries, including the Soviet Union, took part.

The agenda of the meeting, entitled the "Concept of Security for a Greater Europe," meant that a considerable diversity of opinions was inevitable. But, clearly, the new political thinking has already done a lot to ensure that an awareness of the common threats to the continent and the common responsibility for its destiny is the determining factor in discussions of this kind. There were divergences, of course, but despite the diversity of political views, the participants in the forum agreed on the main thing—that East and West must build a united and secure Europe together.

How? Quite a few interesting ideas, some of them new, were voiced on that score.

Take, for example, that most important aspect of East-West political dialogue—the all-European process. First, the meeting highlighted the consensus that this process, begun by the Helsinki conference of 33 European countries plus the United States and Canada, must continue to provide a basis for their cooperation and become ever broader in scale. Second, and this is particularly characteristic, the forum said that the time has come to switch to the creation of permanent European security structures. Such suggestions are prompted by life itself and by an understanding of the fact that the rapid changes in Europe demand more intensive and, most importantly, regular coordination of actions among the participants

in the all-European process. For example, P. Corterier, secretary general of the North Atlantic Assembly, proposed the formation of a European disarmament verification system, while other speakers advocated a crisis prevention center and an arbitration committee. Belgian Foreign Minister Eyskens put the question most fundamentally by proposing the creation of a European Security Council.

"The Helsinki process in general is Europe's guiding thread," Eyskens said, answering my question on the prospects for cooperation among the 35 states. "I believe that it should be the basis on which to develop political openness, which must then develop into a policy of rapprochement. As the movement for reform continues in the East it must be directed in such a way that 'detente' in East-West relations is transformed into 'entente.'"

Great attention was paid to the military component of security. It will not disappear in the near future, of course, but its existence, as the forum said, must envisage such elements as the switch by all countries to a defensive, nonoffensive military doctrine and the corresponding change in the structure and deployment of armed forces, and the elaboration of a joint defensive strategy common to all but applied in the light of national conditions. The forum greeted with interest the proposal from the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation to establish cooperation and mutual assistance among the armed forces of all the countries belonging to the all-European process in the struggle against terrorism and the consequences of natural disasters and industrial catastrophes and in repulsing any external threat to those countries.

Security cannot be strengthened without new steps in the disarmament sphere. Everyone made that point. Even R. Gephardt, leader of the Democratic majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, whose speech was awash with rhetoric, expressed that idea most clearly. What specifically is being proposed here? That the signing of the agreement on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe this year be immediately followed by negotiations on the beginning of stage two of the talks aimed at further lowering the sides' armament as far as possible to a level ensuring nonoffensive defense. That the raising of the question of modernizing tactical nuclear weapons be precluded and that consultations and then talks on their reduction be begun—the sooner the better. And that a new package of military confidence-building measures be elaborated.

The future of NATO and the Warsaw Pact was discussed in broad terms. A curious point emerged here: While advocating the retention of the military alliances, Western participants in the meeting said at the same time that the political aspect should predominate in their activity. A number of speeches even expressed the idea that as NATO and the Warsaw Pact change their character they should gradually move closer together so as to produce an "alliance of alliances" which could become part of the all-European security system, in the form of a disarmament verification body, for example.

In general the discussion showed that in many countries the threat to European security is now seen not so much in terms of the possibility of attack or aggression as of the prospect of increasing instability. The point made by most of the speeches was that the changes in East Europe must not be accompanied by a resurgence of old territorial or political disputes and that a new "field of conflicts," such as existed before World Wars I and II, must not be allowed to occur.

The main reason for this agitation is, of course, the German question. Especially with regard to the process of German unification and the fate of the existing borders in Europe. Noting the ambiguous position of the FRG Government, representatives of the vast majority of the delegations stressed that there should be no uncertainties here: If we want to live in peace, the borders must be left untouched. In that connection there were a number of proposals on guarantees of their inviolability. The most interesting proposal was made by the Belgian foreign minister. "As is well known," he said, "the Helsinki act enshrines the principle of the inviolability of the postwar borders but allows the possibility of changing them in peacetime by negotiation. I believe that it is now necessary to abandon that provision too, to make the borders utterly immutable."

This is a completely new way of putting the question which, I think, deserves the most serious attention.

I asked V.V. Zagladin, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, to assess the meeting's results.

"Such meetings," he noted, "are simply indispensable, because they express ideas which then often lead to decisions. This meeting showed that in today's conditions there is an opportunity to accelerate the disarmament process in Europe and consolidate the political foundations of security on the continent."

Yakovlev Meets European Commission Co-Chairman

LD0603123190 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 6 TASS—Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev met European Co-Chairman of the "Trilateral Commission" Georges Berthoin.

The sides discussed the dynamic processes taking place in Europe, as well as possible forms of interaction in creating a European system of security and cooperation.

Berthoin related the "Trilateral Commission's" ideas about these issues.

Adamishin Reviews First 'Four Plus Two' Meeting

PM1503213890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin by unnamed own correspondent in Bonn; date of interview not given; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction: "The German Question": "'Four Plus Two'"]

[Text] The first meeting within the framework of the "Four Plus Two" group has taken place in the FRG, at the expert level. The Soviet delegation was headed by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin. PRAVDA's own correspondent in Bonn asked him to tell us about this event.

"First, let us note," the diplomat said, "that the mechanism has begun operating and, furthermore, before the GDR elections. What did we do? Clearly, the first meeting was devoted mainly to organizing future work. It was decided that the next meeting at the expert level is to take place in the GDR immediately after the formation of the new government there. That will probably be in the first half of April. As for meetings of ministers, they themselves will decide where they are to meet. The first meeting, we agreed, is to be after the experts' session in Berlin."

[Correspondent] Was it part of your brief to draw up an agenda or order of discussion of questions?

[Adamishin] Yes. Questions that could form the agenda for future conferences were discussed. They include, first and foremost, the external aspects of the building of German unity—for instance, the final international legal consolidation of borders, the military-political status of the future Germany, the rights and responsibility of the four powers, and so forth. As we understand it, it is necessary to work toward drawing up a document that would close the book on World War II. The Soviet view is that ideally this would be a peace treaty.

During the meeting we reached an understanding that all questions—organizational, procedural, and substantive—should be resolved among the "six" on the basis of the principle of consensus. That will encourage us to find solutions that suit everyone....

Military Status of United Germany Questioned

PM1503100790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel I. Vladimirov article: "United Germany and NATO"]

[Text] History is working at an unprecedentedly fast pace today. Only quite recently it was being said both in the West and in the East that the emergence of a united Germany was a remote prospect. It is now being spoken of as a reality.

No one in the world questions the Germans' sovereign right to unification. It is a matter for the Germans themselves to determine its timing and forms. But it is impossible not to notice the FRG leadership's desire to accelerate this process in every possible way, to present the German question as virtually solved, and to act in certain situations ostensibly in the name of the new German state. Concern is also aroused by the very path to unification chosen in Bonn—not gradual rapprochement between the two German states, but the absorption of the GDR without any conditions.

The haste with which people in the West are seeking to resolve the question of the military-political status of the future German state arouses just as much concern. Here even responsible politicians seem to be losing a sense of reality. How else can one assess the ideas they are putting forward to include a united Germany in NATO? Quite recently this thought was reaffirmed by U.S. President G. Bush, in whose opinion a united Germany must remain a full and equal member of NATO, including membership of that alliance's military organization. At the same time the idea that that part of Germany which is today GDR territory will not fall within the North Atlantic bloc's zone of responsibility and that foreign troops or NATO military installations will not be stationed on this territory is being actively promoted.

Such ideas do not stand up to criticism at all. The FRG military-political leadership itself does not even seem to take them seriously. At any rate G. Stoltenberg, the country's defense minister, has declared that NATO's protective guarantees must apply to the whole of Germany and not just to the Federal Republic. Soviet troops may remain temporarily in the former GDR, but the minister believes that it is also necessary to station Bundeswehr subunits there—i.e. move the North Atlantic bloc's zone of responsibility right up to the border with Poland.

True, Federal Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher hastened to dissociate themselves from Stoltenberg's statements, saying that they do not tally with the government's position. However, according to L'HUMANITE, the FRG Foreign Ministry has already prepared a working document on the military-political status of a united Germany. West German diplomats have been instructed to be guided by it in their practical activity. According to this document, at the first stage it is proposed to demobilize the GDR National People's Army without sending Bundeswehr troops onto GDR territory, but on fulfillment of the following conditions: The Soviet Union must renounce its right as a victor power to station its troops in the GDR and must reduce its military presence there to a level that "suits the German people." At the second stage it is planned to send onto the territory of the present GDR "limited contingents of national German troops" which supposedly will not be integrated in NATO or equipped with offensive weapons.

Regardless of the fact that the Soviet Union has its own ideas on its own security interests and it alone has the right to determine their essence, NATO is taking it on

itself to resolve the question of the fate of the Western Group of Forces. However, as the Soviet government statement points out, the presence of foreign troops in both the GDR and the FRG is a special question associated with the four powers' obligations following World War II and can be resolved with due regard for the security interests of all the states concerned. And is it realistic to have a Soviet military presence on the territory of a NATO country?

People in the West are trying to portray Germany's involvement in NATO as the best means of restraining its revanchist aspirations. At the same time any suggestion of the future state's neutrality is resolutely rejected. NATO Secretary General M. Woerner, in particular, warns that a neutral Germany sailing the waves cannot be an acceptable solution, taking into account this country's geostrategic location and its political, economic, and military potential. But for the very same reasons the various versions of a NATO Germany are equally unacceptable to the USSR.

It is no secret that their realization would mean the upsetting of the military-strategic balance between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. People in North Atlantic bloc countries are saying a lot about the stabilizing role of NATO and the Warsaw Pact in the developing situation in Europe and about their great significance for the evolutionary transition to a new system of European security. About the fact that it is only with the help of these alliances that the realization of the future treaty on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe can be ensured. Yet at the same time an overt scheme is being hatched to undermine the Warsaw Pact. Where is the logic here?

A number of other important questions arise in this connection. For example, how, in the light of the talks on conventional forces in Europe, do the NATO countries imagine a corresponding agreement will be reached in Vienna? How do they propose to estimate the correlation of forces in the zone of upcoming reductions? Do the plans to include Germany in NATO not strike at the virtually agreed parameters of the future accords, particularly on upper limits for the arms to be retained by each of the military-political alliances following the reductions? And, finally, what will the reduction zones look like?

As regards the NATO hopes of controlling a united Germany, the example of the WEU [Western European Union] graphically attests to their totally illusory nature. As a result of WEU "control" over the arming of the Bundeswehr the latter has become the most powerful army in West Europe and is equipped, moreover, with nuclear weapon delivery vehicles. Even the NATO countries themselves evidently have little faith in the effectiveness of a coalition control mechanism. Otherwise they would not have come out in favor of resolving the German question within the framework of the all-European process.

The formula conventionally known as "two plus four" was agreed on at the "Open Skies" conference held in Ottawa. The GDR and the FRG, as well as the foreign ministers of the four victor powers, are to comprehensively analyze all the external aspects of the two German states' unification and prepare a basis for concluding a peace treaty with Germany. This alone can define in international law Germany's status in the European structure.

Our country's stand on German affairs, as the USSR Foreign Ministry statement emphasizes, is dictated, above all, by its sincere desire to live in peace and concord with the German and other European peoples and to make a weighty, constructive contribution to all-European peaceful building and to ensuring reliable security on collective principles. The lessons of World War II oblige everyone whom that tragedy affected to do everything to ensure that it is never repeated.

UN Security Council Discusses Israel's Actions

LD1503200190 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] New York (United Nations) March 15 TASS—The UN Security Council today began discussing Israel's unlawful actions on occupied Arab lands, at the Soviet Union's request.

The discussion was opened by the Soviet Union's permanent representative at the United Nations Aleksandr Belonogov, who expressed the Soviet Union's attitude to Israel's settlement of immigrants from other countries on occupied Arab territories. The Soviet Union believes that such steps are very serious and influence security issues in the Middle East.

Belonogov said that the statements by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir and other Israeli leaders on the settlement policy had aroused concern in the Soviet Union.

"We believe that the implementation of this policy violates the norms of international law, escalates tensions and increases confrontation and extremism in the Middle East, including on occupied Arab territories, poses a threat to human rights, security and human life," Belonogov said.

"Sometimes, the Soviet Union hears appeals to ban the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel," Belonogov went on to say. "But, the Soviet Union cannot undertake such a step because it would contradict its policy of granting equal rights and freedoms to all Soviet citizens, irrespective of nationality. At present we are democratising Soviet laws, including those on emigration. The USSR Supreme Soviet will consider a bill on entries and exits from the Soviet Union. The norms contained in the law correspond to those existing in other countries, including the Arab states."

"It is not the Soviet Union that should impose emigration bans. Israel should not settle its own citizens and immigrants on occupied territories. Israel is violating the existing provisions of international law and bears full responsibility for its actions," Belonogov said.

United States & Canada

Bush Salutes Gorbachev on Election to Presidency

LD1503192790 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Washington March 15 TASS—President Bush has sent a congratulatory message to Gorbachev upon his election to the Presidency of the USSR. White House press secretary Marlin Fitzwater told a briefing here today.

Bush sends the best of wishes to Gorbachev at a time when the Soviet Union embarks in a new stage of perestroyka and democratisation, Fitzwater said.

The president of the United States hopes that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit will make it possible to expand the already considerably elements of cooperation between the two countries.

Bush 'Looking Forward' to Meeting With Gorbachev

LD1603101390 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 16 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington March 16 TASS—U.S. President George Bush told journalists here on Thursday that he was looking forward to meeting Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev during this summer's superpower summit.

He said that the U.S. was in a good position to conclude accords with the Soviet Union on further arms cuts.

Bush made his comments at a question-and-answer session with the board of directors of the National Newspaper Association.

The U.S. President, who wields considerable executive power in his country, in answer to questions related to the election of Mikhail Gorbachev to the post of the president of the Soviet Union, said he did not see any danger of a "dictatorship evolving" in the Soviet Union.

"They've come out of the totalitarianism of the past. I don't see it as a threat," he said. "They've given the new president great powers, but no, I don't see it as a threat."

Bush said the U.S. favours perestroyka and reforms and wants Gorbachev to be a success.

He said he consulted with him and exchanged messages with him on German unity, for example, "and I think he is a reasonable man."

"I am not worried about the constitutional changes, because as you look at the total picture inside the Soviet Union you see an evolution that none of us would have believed possible five years ago, or three or two in terms of democratic institutions."

Shevardnadze Receives U.S. Ambassador 15 Mar

LD1503200890 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today received U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Jack Matlock at the latter's request.

Some current issues of Soviet-Amercian relations, also from the viewpoint of preparation of a Soviet-American summit, to be held in the United States in June, were discussed.

U.S.-Soviet Talks on Asia-Pacific Region End

LD1503130790 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Paris March 15 TASS—Soviet U.S. consultations on the situation in the Asia-Pacific region were held here between March 14 and 15.

The sides discussed, in particular, prospects for a comprehensive political settlement around Cambodia, the situation in the Korean peninsula and some aspects of a military and political detente in that area.

They stressed the importance of establishing wide-scale economic cooperation between all regional countries and mutually beneficial economic, cultural and other relations between the Soviet Far East and U.S. Pacific states.

The consultations were attended by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Solomon.

Bush, Congress Clash on Democracy Fund Predicted

PM1503145390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Gan dispatch under "Correspondent Comments" rubric: "Two Sides of One Decision"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 14 Mar—Speaking at a press conference in the White House today, Bush put forward a proposal of a kind that are made by U.S. presidents once in a blue moon. In any case, nothing like this has been heard from a president's lips in recent decades.

What he actually said was that he would like to appropriate 800 million dollars from the Pentagon budget for financial and economic aid to Panama and Nicaragua ($500 million for the former, and $300 million for the latter).

For those who follow the actions of the administration, there is more than enough that is unusual and contradictory in this declaration. On the one hand, Bush has actually admitted that the "Soviet threat" to the United States—until very recently the favorite argument of the White House and Defense Secretary Cheney—has not only not increased but, on the contrary, decreased. Thus, cutting back inflated military appropriations is a realistic

proposition which by no means jeopardizes U.S. national security. [passage omitted]

The White House is perfectly well aware that without U.S. dollars, without U.S. aid, Managua cannot manage. In taking this extraordinary decision and, in addition, lifting the economic embargo against Nicaragua, Bush has obviously decided to prove, one way or another, that democracy U.S.-style is bound to "work."

It ought to be added that by no means everyone agrees with him in Washington. Voices have already been heard on Capitol Hill expressing dissatisfaction that the "peace dividend" whose existence has been denied up to now, so to speak, is suddenly disappearing abroad. A number of Congressmen have resolutely accused the president of low trickery declaring that his new plan for setting up a "democracy fund" for Central America will simply not get through unless the White House publicly pledges to find the funds being asked for within its own budget request which was submitted to the lawmakers six weeks ago. The "budget poker game between the administration and the Congress is getting more and more serious," Washington observers have concluded.

Plans for New USSR-U.S. Air Routes Reported

PM1303155990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[V. Belikov report: "USSR-U.S. Flights: Frequency Doubled"]

[Text] With the beginning of spring-summer air travel on international routes—which will start 1 April—the frequency of Aeroflot flights from Moscow and Leningrad to New York and Washington will rise from seven to 15 flights a week for Il-62M aircraft.

IZVESTIYA's correspondent was told at the Ministry of Civil Aviation External Relations Administration that an accord has been secured after long talks with the Americans for a considerable expansion in air travel between the two countries.

This year Aeroflot and Pan American will continue flights on a reciprocal basis. From spring 1991 Soviet airliners will be able to fly to San Francisco, Chicago, Miami, and Anchorage (Alaska) in addition to New York and Washington. Americans have won the right to fly to Kiev, Minsk, Tbilisi, Riga, Khabarovsk, and Magadan in addition to Moscow and Leningrad.

An air route from the Far East to the U.S. Pacific coast will come into operation in addition to the transatlantic air "corridor."

Next spring, each side will make 22 weekly flights on existing routes. This will increase by another 20 flights between the two countries' cities which will be served by the airlines for the first time. It is planned to have 37 flights a week in 1992 between Moscow, Leningrad, New York, and Washington.

Thus the problem of restricting the number of flights between the two countries has been eliminated, but the question of what aircraft to operate is arising with increasing acuteness for Aeroflot. The arrival of several leased West European A-310 airbuses next fall will help to partially resolve the situation, but our main hopes are pinned on the belated Soviet Il-96.

Smuggled Duplicators Found Among Charity Freight

PM1303170590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent I. Tikhomirov dispatch: "The Case of the Trojan Syringe"]

[Text] Kiev—The people of Kiev gave an unusually warm, even affectionate reception to the enormous Ruslan AN-124 aircraft. Well, they would, of course! It was bringing more than 82 tonnes of medicines, vitamins, diverse medical equipment, food, and clothing from New York's Kennedy Airport.

All this was for children suffering from the effects of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. The value of these indisputably necessary items was increased many times over by the fact that they had been assembled and dispatched by friendly hands. They were also aware of this across the ocean.

"The sendoff for the aircraft developed into a demonstration of charity," A. Bulanenko, assistant chief designer at the Antonov Experimental Design Office, where the Ruslan was designed, said, having flown in on the aircraft himself. "A press conference was held, where people were told how Ukrainians in the United States and Canada had initially collected the money, before coming up with the idea of using this money to buy medicines and other gifts."

Those who met the Ruslan at Borispolskiy Airport spoke equally warm, grateful words at the steps of the aircraft and then at a press conference. Naturally, they had to get down to business after that. A committee of representatives of the Red Cross Society and informal associations was set up under the patronage of the republic's Ministry of Health to distribute the gifts.

It ran into difficulties literally straightaway. These difficulties were such that another press conference had to be called. At the conference, the head of the Borispolskiy Customs Office, S. Didenko, said that only 3,186 of the 3,225 items of freight packed on board the Ruslan were destined for the Ministry of Health. The rest, apart from one, had no addressees. Among these were 10 rotary duplicating machines.

It would have taken a long time to work out why they had been sent to the children of Chernobyl if it had not been for a label on the last one. On it was written: "UKRAYINSKYY VISNYK, to be delivered to Mr. Vyacheslav Chornovol." This was followed by a postal address in Lvov. A rather interesting letter was also removed from

the same box. It listed everything sent to "Mr. Vyacheslav" and included instructions on how to use the duplicating equipment. The letter ended with two requests: Would he confirm that he had received the items and also say whether he needed any new texts and printer's ink?

Mr. Vyacheslav will not be able to comply with the first request for a while: It is for legal experts to decide whether the items being sent to him were legally entitled to be on board the Soviet aircraft. The second request need not have been made at all. The publications of which Chernovol is in charge are increasingly vilifying the party and everything connected with the Soviet system. So a use will be found for paper and ink.

It goes without saying that the thousands of Ukrainians in the United States and Canada who carefully assembled the medicines and gifts for children who are the victims of the Chernobyl disaster had nothing to do with the gift smuggled onto the Ruslan with them. It only remains to be regretted that a joyous event symbolizing kindness and charity should have been clouded by this unfortunate incident.

China

PRC Spokesman on Lithuania, Li Peng Visit

OW1503184490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman announced in Beijing today that China wants to develop relations with the USSR on the basis of the agreements reached at the Sino-Soviet summit in Beijing last year, as well as on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The spokesman told Chinese and foreign correspondents at a press briefing that the developments in the Soviet Union are the internal affair of the USSR and that China will not interfere with them. He pointed out: China is closely watching developments in Lithuania. He said: During Li Peng's upcoming visit to the Soviet Union, the leaders of the two countries' governments will discuss matters of mutual interest.

Commentary on Soviet Delegation's Visit to PRC

OW1603033690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Unattributed commentary from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Katushev, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, concluded his visit to China. From what I learned of the trip, I realized once again that Soviet-Chinese cooperation, including economic and trade cooperation, has been developing on a solid basis of mutual interest. Katushev, head of the Soviet Government delegation, said in an interview with TASS: The fact that a ministerial meeting between the two nations on issues of foreign trade and economic contacts was held after a break of 30 years can be attributed to Gorbachev's China visit last May. The meeting was very successful.

The Soviet minister said: We summarized the extensive preparations both sides made beforehand and determined the cooperation pattern and volume of trade for 1990. The projected trade volume is a 36 percent increase from what was actually achieved according to the 1989 agreement. This again represents stable growth in two-way trade, which is very gratifying.

Katushev continued: The Soviet Union will increase its exports of machinery by 55 percent to China, a significant part of which will be power and aviation equipment. China's need for mechanical products is determined by China's rapid development in electricity and air transportation. We will also raise by a large amount our supply of rolled ferrous metal, pig iron, aluminum, timber, and (?carbamide) to China. According to its proposal, China will increase its exports to the Soviet Union by 80 percent this year. The Chinese exports include industrial commodities and foodstuffs that have been in short supply in Soviet markets. During the talks, both parties held that the prospects of the two nations' economic and trade relations is very bright. Its potential, when fully explored, will be beneficial to the peoples of both nations.

Chinese Minister Zheng Tuobing, who attended the talks, emphatically pointed out: The Soviet delegation's visit to China and the talks held in Beijing went smoothly. We are pleased with the developments in bilateral trade in recent years. As it stands now, Sino-Soviet trade volume is the fifth highest of China's foreign trade volume.

Pointing to the huge potential of trade and economic cooperation between the two nations, Zheng Tuobing expressed his belief that with both sides making greater efforts, economic and trade contacts between China and the Soviet Union will further develop.

Kim Il-song, Jiang Zemin Meeting Reported

PM1503150790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 14 Mar—Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, arrived here today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers Party Central Committee and president of the DPRK.

On the same day there were talks between Kim Il-song and Jiang Zemin, which, as the Korean Central News Agency notes, took place "in an atmosphere of comradeship, cordiality, and friendship."

The DPRK leader expressed support for China's course of carrying out socialist reforms and the policy of openness and noted that "last year the party, government, and people of China managed to promptly quash the counterrevolutionary rebellion that occurred as a result of machinations by internal and external reaction."

Northeast Asia

MPRP Central Committee Plenum Concludes Work

PRAVDA Reports Plenum Activities

PM1503114390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sapov dispatch: "Defending the Vanguard Role"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 14 Mar—The Mongolian public has met with understanding the report that the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee Politburo and Central Committee secretaries have decided to resign en masse at the Eighth Central Committee Plenum, currently under way in Ulaanbaatar. So many problems have accumulated in the country that without cardinal perestroyka of the political system the process of the renewal of society, which has been initiated by the party itself, could end up in an impasse. The main reason for the current situation, the plenum noted, is the persisting bureaucratic edict system and substantial delays in the party's work to change it.

Before the opening of the plenum a wave of demonstrations and rallies swept through the country. The growing activeness of the nonparty masses expressed itself in the establishment of a series of informal organizations. An open dialogue between the ruling party and the other political forces induced the MPRP to take emergency measures.

The Central Committee plenum, which is taking place in a spirit of criticism and self-criticism, has made a principled assessment of the party leadership and focused the Central Committee's attention on improving the party's organizational structure. In view of the prevailing situation, it has been decided to convene an extraordinary MPRP Congress 10 April and to advance the date of the next regular supreme party forum. A proposal put forward by both communists and their opponents on deleting clauses from the preamble and Article 82 of the constitution has been adopted, which in practice means the party has renounced its monopoly of power.

Henceforth the MPRP is ready to cooperate with all political forces with a view to establishing a rule-of-law state and humane, democratic socialism on a Marxist-Leninist basis, proceeding from Mongolia's specific conditions. As for the leading role, the MPRP is prepared to contest it together with other political parties by political methods and practical actions. At party meetings and mass rallies the question was raised of the separation of the functions of party and state power, and a positive solution has been found. The plenum has proposed to accelerate the elaboration of the draft new Constitution of the Mongolian People's Republic, initiate its nationwide discussion, and bring elections to the People's Great Hural forward from 1991 to the current year. A commission to prepare the extraordinary party congress has been set up.

The MPRP's history, it was emphasized at the plenum, does not consist entirely of mistakes and distortions. The successes achieved by the people during the past 70 years under the leadership of their vanguard—the MPRP—cannot be wholly denied. It would be equally wrong to ascribe the mistakes committed by H. Choybalsan and Yu. Tsedenbal to the party as a whole.

The party of Mongolian communists continues to contest the vanguard role in society without diverging from its general line and proceeding firmly from the position of perestroyka. In this it has the support of broad sections of the population.

The plenum elected Gombojabyn Ochirbat general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee. He is 61 years old. He has worked in the past as chief of the party Central Committee Ideological Department and subsequently as chairman of the Central Council of Mongolian Trade Unions. For the past two years Comrade G. Ochirbat represented the MPRP at the editorial office of the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA.

Former MPRP Leader Expelled

LD1503141490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 Mar (TASS)—Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal, former leader of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] and the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] has been excluded from the ranks of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. The Eighth Plenum of the MPRP Central Committee which took place here passed such a decision.

Heading the MPRP and the people's state from 1940 until 1984 practically without a break, Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal committed serious violations of party and state discipline the more that party and state power were concentrated in his hands, affirmed the command and administrative style, scorned the collegiate nature [kollegialnost] of leadership, perverted cadre policy, permitted distortions with regard to the intelligentsia and thereby inflicted great damage to the cause of the party and the people. He flouted the principles of social justice, this decision stresses.

All that for a long time had a negative influence upon the development of democracy and glasnost in the country, the document points out.

Constitution To Be Revised

LD1503140390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 Mar (TASS)—Having completed its work, the Eighth MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee Plenum unanimously approved the document "On the proposal on amending the clauses on the MPRP in the Constitution of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic]."

The plenum considers it advisable to present to the People's Great Hural the proposal to review the clause in the preamble of the country's main law affirming that "the leading and guiding force of state and society in the Mongolian People's Republic is the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party which is guided in its activity by the invincible Marxist-Leninist theory." It is also proposed to review the 82d Article of the MPR Constitution, which says that "the most active and conscious citizens—the best representatives of the workers and working intelligentsia—are united in the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the advance guard and leader of the state and social organizations of the working people."

Fourteen 'Released From Duties'

LD1503121490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0809 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Ulaanbaataar, 15 Mar (TASS)—The 8th MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee Plenum finished its work here on Wednesday. [passage omitted]

Fourteen members of the Central Committee who reached pension age were released from duties.

Veteran on Soviet Combat Pilots in Korea in 1950

SK1603055890 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] Some time ago we knew little about Soviet Union's military aid to the DPRK and other friendly countries. The domestic situation has changed, and glasnost helps to further reveal new facts of our history with every passing day. A group of veterans who participated in the liberation of Korea and the 1950-1953 war, are working in the Soviet Committee of War Veterans to promote their unity.

Station reporter (Vadin Kavayev) interviewed (George Bullutinikov), leader of the group with a junior doctorate in history. He said: [Begin (George Bullutinikov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] It has not been long since our group was organized. When I worked for the Military History Research Institute of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, the leadership of the Soviet Committee of War Veterans requested my help on many occasions. In November 1988 when I discharged my military service, I began to lead the group. At that time, the number of members was approximately 15. Most of them participated in the war to liberate Korea.

A decision was adopted to admit all international fighters who were involved in rendering the people's Korea military aid during different periods. In the beginning, however, those who took part in the 1950-1953 Korean War, were not included in this group. My work as the leader of the group was first directed at looking for such veterans. To this end, I visited the General Personnel Bureau of the Soviet Ministry of Defense and analyzed the list of those who were awarded for their participation in the 1950-1953 war. As a result, we found 21 Soviet heroes. Most of them were pilots who participated in the combat in October 1950. Many of them are actively taking part in the work of our group. [end recording]

Answering the question of how large the Korean group of the Soviet Committee of War Veterans was and what projects they are involved in, he said:

[Begin (George Bullutinikov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] Our group has approximately 40 members at present. We do not distinguish between those who participated in the war to liberate Korea and those who took part in the 1950-1953 Korean people's fatherland liberation war. We regard it as our duty to search for veterans who participated in the Korean War. Also, our group organizes meetings with social dignitaries and publishes articles, reminiscences, [words indistinct]. Those who were wounded [words indistinct].

This kind of book is being prepared for those who discharged their internationalistic obligations in Afghanistan. As is known, more than 13,000 soldiers died in Afghanistan. When the number of fallen Soviet internationalistic fighters in all combat in which they participated is included, however, the total number of victims would be more than that.

For example, approximately 8,000 Soviet fighters are buried in Mongolia. Also, numerous Soviet soldiers were killed in Korea, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Angola, Algeria, and the Arab-Israel war. Many families who have lost fathers, husbands, and sons have the right to know about when and where they died. It is no secret that awards during the Great Fatherland War are stilling waiting for their owners. We cannot forget our history.

Although they knew that the Vietnamese War was not supported at home, Americans secured funds to erect a monument in memory of those fallen soldiers in the Vietnamese War. In our country, however, we were given the impression that there were no war, exploits, or fallen soldiers abroad. Some veterans I met were unaware that as internationlistic fighters, they can be given special medical and welfare service. Many of them were crippled in the course of discharging their internationalistic obligations. There have been cases in which these veterans have been regarded not as war veterans

but as those who have returned home after recuperation at sanitaria. This results from [words indistinct]. [end recording]

Answering the next question whether the group has relations with any veterans' organization in the people's Korea, he said: [Begin (George Bullutinikov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] Regrettably, we have no relations with such an organization. This year, we plan to invite Korean veterans who fought with our pilots in the airspace of Korea. I should talk about vigorous activities [words indistinct] to find materials concerning the Korean war. This confirms that our work is required and that historical lessons can teach us many things. [end recording]

Kaifu's Approach To Developing Ties Welcomed

OW06300629 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Andreyev commentary]

[Text] At his first press conference held after the new cabinet was formed on 28 February, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu stated that Japan wanted to improve its relations with the Soviet Union in various fields. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Andreyev states as follows:

It was, perhaps, for the first time that the Japanese prime minister attached so much importance to Japanese-Soviet relations at an official press conference and proposed that the task of stabilizing relations with the Soviet Union should be taken as one of the major foreign policies of the new administration. Prime Minister Kaifu stated that the Soviet Union has always occupied an important position in the Japanese policies because it is beyond any doubt that the Soviet Union is one of Japan's major neighboring powers in the world. The prime minister also pointed out that Japan regards the early conclusion of a peace treaty as one of the major bases for implementing its policies toward the Soviet Union.

Moreover, the prime minister spoke highly of the efforts made by both governments in this orientation, and pointed out that a permanent working group on the conclusion of a peace treaty had already been set up and that all the problems concerning this task would be discussed at the sessions of this group. Top-level delegations have exchanged visits and leaders of our two nations have exchanged messages. Prime Minister Kaifu also added that constant contacts between Japan and the Soviet Union would lead to good results.

The Soviet Union welcomes such an approach toward the development of the bilateral relations as stated by the Japanese prime minister. And the Soviet side is satisfied with the fact that the dialogues between the Soviet Union and Japan have been developing positively in recent times. A Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo, paid a visit to Japan, and Mr. Shintaro Abe held talks with General Secretary Gorbachev while leading a delegation of the Liberal Democratic Party, the ruling party of Japan, to visit the Soviet Union. Their visits have become the most unprecedented events in this process. Regular foreign ministerial consultations between our two nations have also become an important factor in the Soviet-Japanese dialogues.

As can be noted in statements issued by an official Japanese source, the Japanese people have indicated their understanding regarding the postponement of Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Japan, which was originally scheduled for March. At a recent press conference, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze stated that he would visit Japan and that preparations for his visit were in progress. The Soviet side wants to discuss the issue on lowering the level of military confrontation and the situation in the Pacific region during Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Japan. Meanwhile, the Japanese side seems to understand that the Soviet-Japanese relations have dropped below the level appropriate for the two neighboring powers and that they have fallen behind the dynamic development in the world today.

To overcome this situation, the Soviet Union and Japan have great potentials in promoting cooperation in economic, scientific and technological, and other fields. In this connection, the Soviet Union welcomes Prime Minister Kaifu's call for expanding the bilateral relations in many fields and hopes that his call will be implemented in concrete terms.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary on Reduced Soviet, U.S. Asia Presence

HK1403030590 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Soviet Ambassador to the Philippines Oleg Sokolov has said that his country plans to remove all their warships and planes from Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam. Actually the reduction of Soviet forces in Vietnam started last year. A major portion of the airforce has been pulled out completely, and only 10 military planes are left in Cam Ranh Bay. During the next (?years), it is expected that all Soviet transport in Vietnam will be gone, as well as 60 ships [words indistinct] from the Pacific fleet.

Sokolov explained that the Soviet Union will maintain a limited presence in the Pacific which will not [words indistinct]. On the other hand, American officials in Manila continue to [words indistinct] about the Soviet Union. This was recently repeated by [name indistinct], Subic Naval Base spokesman. So what does this repeated declaration signify?

It has been disclosed that [words indistinct] moves by the United States are aimed at creating a certain scenario, prior to the talks between Manila and Washington on the issue of the military bases. The present situation is not favorable to the United States, since many Filipinos—including several senators—believe that the military bases should no longer remain in the Philippines.

But the matter of [words indistinct] is something to which Washington will not agree. Meanwhile American Embassy Spokesman Kenneth Quinn said that the matter of nuclear stockpiling in the bases as well as the joint use of the bases by both the U.S. and the Philippines rests on the issue of financial assistance. Quinn's revelation that funds will only be given to the Philippines in exchange for an agreement to let the military bases stay on only indicates that pressure on the Philippines will increase.

Cultural Cooperation Agreement With Philippines

LD0903211890 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 9 Mar 90

[Text] Manila March 9 TASS—The friendship societies of the USSR and the Philippines have signed a plan of cultural cooperation for 1990-91.

It provides for holding a Soviet festival in the Philippines, organising a meeting of Soviet and Philippine people in Vladivostok and developing ties according to professional interests.

Burmese Economy Examined Before Elections

BK1403133590 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 14 Mar 90

[TASS observer (Yevgeniy Sherelov) commentary]

[Text] There has been news about Myanmar [Burma] selling part of its embassy lot in Tokyo and its trading of air passage rights. The transactions were reported to be worth about $406 million. With the way land prices are soaring in Japan, Myanmar could have reaped a lot more if it had waited, say, some two years. But, as our TASS observer says, it appears that the Myanmar Government cannot afford to do that because of the tight financial situation facing it today.

According to reports, it is understood that Myanmar had a foreign debt burden of more than $500 million in 1988 which is 70 percent of its gross national product. According to present commitments, foreign debt servicing is about 90 percent of its trading income. Observers believe that the halt in foreign assistance to Myanmar following the military coup in 1988 brought about dire consequences to the country. This is because even the agricultural sector could no longer revolve normally without the importation of fertilizers, farm implements, and other material input from abroad.

The Myanmar military government took certain steps to overcome the adverse situation. It introduced laws to practice an open-door economic policy. But foreign entrepreneurs fear the uncertainty of Myanmar even in the near future and the large amount of national currency circulating at a phenomenally high official exchange rate. Moreover, certain important questions regarding economic decisions also remained unresolved as before; for instance, the questions concerning tax rates, the percentage of profits foreign firms engaged in joint ventures are permitted to take out of the country, and the right of foreign entrepreneurs to buy land.

What then has Myanmar achieved under its new policy? First, we have to point out the fact about licenses being sold to foreign entrepreneurs to exploit the resources of the country. Thai timber companies signed 22 contracts worth $100 million with General Saw Maung's government to extract good Myanmar timber for sale abroad. In addition, Myanmar obtained $18 million from eight big Thai, Malaysian, Singaporean, and Hong Kong companies to fish in Myanmar territorial waters. International oil companies have also been dividing blocks in Myanmar where they believe oil can be found. These deals were undertaken with stipulations in favor of the foreigners. Foreign companies were given a certain territory at a rate of $5 million per block and, for 5 years, these territories can be managed according to their wishes.

Even then, foreign companies are still very cautious in their approach to Myanmar for cooperation. Capitalists working in Myanmar today are concerned that new political sanctions might emerge. For instance, they fear that the United States might act against people who responded to the calls for cooperation from Yangon [Rangoon]. They place certain hopes for the elections to be held on 27 May.

TASS observer (Yevgeniy Sherelov) says fair outcome and the successful holding of the elections will positively contribute to the national economic situation in Myanmar as well as to the relations with its foreign economic partners.

Near East & South Asia

Vorontsov on 'Special Measures' Against Israel

LD1503174190 Kuwait KUNA in English 1613 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 15 (KUNA)—First Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov Thursday said that his country would take "special measures" if Israel fails to recognize world resolution on settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

In a statement to KUNA, the Soviet official underlined that Moscow attaches great importance to the UN Secruity Council meeting to muster out a deterent decision forcing Israel to refrain from settling any immigrants in occupied Arab territories.

The Soviet official did not hint what measures Moscow would take in case Israel refused to accept the world body's decision.

Meanwhile, Vorontsov described the recent visit to Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, by a Foreign Ministry delegation, led by the ministry's Director for Middle East and North African Affairs Vladimir Buliakov as "very fruitful" and expressed satisfaction over the advancement in relations between the two countries.

U.S. Blamed for Government Crisis in Israel

TA1503183990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Commentary by Dimitriy Prokofyev]

[Text] Responsibility for the crisis in Israel which could arrest the Middle East's advance toward a peace solution does not lie with Shamir or Peres but with the U.S. Government. This is the opinion of HA'ARETZ commentator Yo'el Marcus. He likens the policy Washington has been conducting in the last few weeks to an elephant walking through a china shop. Among other things, Marcus says, by taking the ill-timed move of placing the question of East Jerusalem on the agenda, the United States enabled Shamir to create a government crisis and, consequently, to preclude a positive response to the proposed negotiations with the Palestinians. This is what our commentator Dimitriy Prokofyev has to say:

To a certain extent, Yo'el Marcus is definitely right. Indeed, all the participants in the Middle East process have so far circumvented the question of East Jerusalem. Everybody thought that if this issue were brought up, it would be brought up at a later stage of the negotiations, because at the moment there is a head-on split between two national consensuses on this question. All the Arabs demand a restoration of their national rights, while most Israelis are not prepared to give back territory and they believe that Jerusalem must be a united city and the eternal capital of the State of Israel.

In any event, if the peace process advances properly, this issue will be discussed sooner or later. But not now, when both sides are burdened by fears, suspicion, and mistrust. In this respect, President Bush's declaration about the need to discuss the question of East Jerusalem already at this point objectively acted as a provocation. Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir demanded from his coalition partners an advance pledge not to ever conduct such negotiations; and, when the Alignment refused, Shamir brought things to a head and created a government crisis.

(?This time, however), the question does not pertain to Washington's attitude toward one concrete aspect of the Israeli-Arab solution. Moreover, it was stated in a news conference in Washington yesterday, that this is a traditional U.S. position which has not changed at all. The question, then, is different: Are the statements of the U.S. Administration about its striving to contribute to the advancement of peace in the region coupled with concrete actions? Of course, White House policy, just like that of any government in the world, is not free of errors. However, if one collects all those errors, even if only those committed in the last few days, suspicions obviously arise that there is a method to those errors. It would be enough to bring up one example: U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney's reaction to reports on the government crisis in Israel. It is of particular importance at the moment, Cheney said, to reiterate that the U.S. commitments toward Israel remain in effect, albeit in diminished form, and relations with Israel have never been better than in the days of the current government [sentence as heard]. This may have been a slip of the tongue; once again an elephant walking through a china shop, as Yo'el Marcus put it. Nevertheless, Cheney proceeded to provide a detailed list of modern weapons, mainly of an offensive nature, which would be delivered within the next few months to Israel, or to be more precise, to the government of Shamir, the rejecter of peace whose attitude toward a solution in the Middle East can be summed up in three words: Greater Eretz Yisra'el.

I think these were not U.S. errors, but yet another display of unqualified support for the extreme right-wing circles in the Israeli establishment.

U.S. Involvement in Al-Rabitah Fire Questioned

LD1503201290 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Commentary by Oleg Grikov]

[Text] Major international news agencies reported today a flash news item, quoting JANA's spokesman, on a fire at the al-Rabitah chemical plant. Here is a commentary by Oleg Grikov on the large amount of international interest in the news reports on this plant. The commentary is entitled: The al-Rabitah Fire: Smoke Before Fire.

[Grikov] The questions which have been raised on the al-Rabitah plant should lead us to wonder about the security problems surrounding production as well as an international security in general. Washington resumed recently its concerted propaganda campaign, claiming that Libya has been producing chemical weapons at al-Rabitah, despite Libya's repeated statements that the plant only produces pharmaceuticals, and its readiness to allow an international investigation at the plant. In this respect, a number of Arab media outlets have voiced the fear that the U.S. propaganda campaign might be a prelude, as before, for a new military action against Libya. However, the outcome has been different. The plant has not been damaged by U.S. missiles but by a fire. However, the causes of the fire have yet to be discovered. Was the fire caused by pure coincidence, at a period when Libya was facing a fierce U.S. propaganda campaign? JANA's spokesman at the United Nations did not exclude that an act of sabotage carried out by the United States and Israel might have been the cause of the

fire. Washington and Israel have, however, vehemently denied any involvement in the incident. Therefore, who is telling the truth and who is not? A question which has yet to be answered.

Some other strange aspects in Washington's official behavior during the past 24 hours also need clarification: Washington reported the fire before any official Libyan statements on this matter. The White House spokesman attributed such excellent intelligence to an Italian report received through diplomatic channels. However, the Italian Foreign Ministry announced that no such report had been channeled to Washington, and that Rome did not know anything about the fire until this morning. The Tunisian Foreign Ministry has also denied a U.S. report that the borders with Libya were closed. Therefore, it seems that such a report was published ahead in Washington in order to show that Tripoli pays extraordinary importance to the al-Rabitah plant. Tunisia has announced that everything is normal along its borders with Libya. Facts show, however, that it was Washington which during the last 24 hours paid, an extraordinary amount of interest in the al-Rabitah plant and tried to hide behind a propaganda smoke screen.

However, what is behind such a screen is a matter worrying a huge number of people.

U.S. Claims of Libyan Toxin Plant Reported

PM1303130590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Blinov: "Washington Expresses Concern"]

[Text] Washington—The U.S. Administration has again raised the question of the Libyan enterprise which, it claims, has begun the production of toxins. Here Washington does not rule out the possibility of taking any measures to prevent the plant from continuing to function.

Claims that the pharmaceutical factory in Rabta [name as transliterated] constructed by the Libyans with the assistance of foreign firms, mainly West German, is an enterprise for the production of toxins was denied by the Libyan authorities last year.

THE WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES have reported, citing a report of experts from the U.S. Defense Department's intelligence department, that last year the factory in Rabta produced 30 tonnes of mustard gas (a toxin from the World War I period) and has begun the production of the nerve gas sarin, more effective in terms of its harmful properties. The enterprise is allegedly planning to switch from the experimental production to the large-scale production of these toxins.

The report speaks of "alarm signals" attesting to the factory's preparation to develop the full-scale production of chemicals—its transfer to the control of the military, the dismissal of Pakistani workers, and the construction in Libya of special storage facilities for chemical weapons.

An official spokesman for the Pentagon made no comment on the reports citing military intelligence. But the accusations against Libya were repeated at a higher level. White House press secretary Marlin Fitzwater stated at a briefing for journalists last Wednesday that the United States "has information" about Libya's production of toxins. Fitzwater urged that "resolute efforts be made to halt the enterprise's activity," without specifying what form these efforts should take. According to him, the United States maintains contacts with its allies aimed at resolving this problem. To the question of whether these contacts could lead to any actions on the military plane, Fitzwater replied that he "cannot rule out anything."

Bazoft Death Penalty 'Totally Unacceptable'

PM1503210890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[A. Anichkin report: "OBSERVER Journalist Executed"]

[Excerpts] Farzad Bazoft, 31-year-old correspondent for the British newspaper THE OBSERVER, was hanged on Thursday morning, following sentence by an Iraqi court martial.

Journalists often have to risk their lives in fulfilling their professional duties. Journalists are doubly at risk where people are reluctant to recognize their unconditional right to a civilized attitude toward the profession of reporter.

The execution was carried out in haste, two days earlier than scheduled and in the face of desperate attempts to save him on the part of the British Government, including Prime Minister M. Thatcher, who sent several messages to Iraqi President Saddam Husayn requesting clemency. Representatives of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg called for a reconsideration of the sentences on Bazoft and on the British nurse Daphne Parish who was sentenced at the same time (to 15 years' imprisonment). IZVESTIYA (No. 71) has already reported their trial.

The president of Iraq, news agencies report fron Baghdad, stated the day before that he is "not frightened" of Britain's displeasure. The Iraqi side also rejected Britain's request for an urgent visit to Baghdad by Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, who intended to make a personal appeal to the president, who, according to UPI, has to confirm death sentences before they are carried out.

F. Bazoft was arrested last September near a military complex south of Baghdad, where there had been a major disaster not long before. He was charged with spying. In a videotaped statement Bazoft confessed to being a spy, but in court he resolutely rejected the charge. According to the testimony of people who saw the video,

coercion had patently been used against the prisoner. Immediately before the execution a staffer of the British Embassy in Iraq met with the journalist. F. Bazoft stated once again that he was only carrying out a journalistic investigation, and asked for some personal messages to be conveyed.

The execution prompted indignation in Britain. The foreign secretary called it a "barbarous act." Labor Party leader Neil Kinnock said that it is "savagery indicating contempt for justice and world public opinion." [passage omitted]

We at IZVESTIYA do not propose to express an opinion on how far the charges against him were justified. But we are firmly convinced that the death penalty for a journalist is a totally unacceptable measure in the civilized world. And we hope that this view is shared by all our colleagues in the Soviet Union and in other countries.

Commentary Views Kurdistan Situation, Trials

NC1503171590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Oleg Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Our commentary is on Kurdistan because Iraqi President Saddam Husayn has declared a general amnesty for all the Kurdistan opposition and has proposed that they return to Iraq within two months and choose where they want to live.

Our commentator Oleg Ivanov writes: Among the many Near East problems, the problem of the Kurdish people ranks second in the entire world. Palestine, Lebanon, and the Iran-Iraq war have seldom allowed the issue of the Kurdish people to make the headlines. But this does not take anything away from the tragedy faced by the Kurds. This tragedy is basically divided into three parts. Actually the Kurds are more populous than all the Lebanese and Palestinians. The Iran-Iraq war was a difficult test for the Kurds. The front line, not the border, has pierced the living body of this nation. Naturally both sides in the confrontation did not spare any efforts to exploit the Kurds for their own objectives—objectives that have nothing to do with the interests of this nation. The Jalal Talebani group and the Barzani leaders sided with Tehran and used its support. This created yet another knot in the already complicated Kurdish problem.

The Iran-Iraq war itself, and the blow inflicted by Baghdad on the Kurds after the end of the war, forced thousands of people to leave their birthplaces. According to figures, the number of Kurds who sought refuge in Turkey alone was 120,000, while it is difficult to determine the number of Kurds who went to Iran. The fate of the refugees is bitter. Morevoer, both in Turkey and in Iran—where not too much attention is paid to the Kurds who are living in their territories—Iraqi refugees are facing immense problems. They have faced poverty and have been deprived of their rights.

But the Iraqi society today is different from what it was during the war. A nation that has been through immense crises and has given many sacrifices made it understood to Baghdad that it does not want to live as it did in the past.

The process of democratization is progressing slowly but surely. Saddam Husayn has announced his readiness to (?reform) and to introduce a multiparty system in the country. The general amnesty extended to the Kurdish refugees even if they cooperated with Tehran during the war is apparently a step toward the democratization of Iraq and toward the unity of the Iraqi peoples—the Arabs and the Kurds. Moreover, the genuine conditions for this exist. Iraq is the only country that has recognized the Kurds' autonomy in the areas where they live. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the day on which this autonomy was declared.

Normalizing life in these rich and resourceful areas in Iraq is to the benefit of both the Kurds and the Arabs. It should be noted that this general amensty will, if accepted by the Kurds living abroad, improve's Iraq's credibility as far as observing human rights is concerned.

Of course the general amnesty will not solve the complicated and numerous problems of the Kurdish people in Iraq immediately. But everything starts when the first step is taken, and it seems that this has been done.

Afghan Army Political Chief Cited on Situation

PM1503142590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Lt Col A. Oliynik telephone dispatch: "Alarming March"]

[Text] Kabul, 13 Mar—March in Afghanistan, according to the solar calendar, is the last month of the year. Next week the country will enter the new year of 1369. But it is not this event which concerns the Afghans today. As before they have no peace: There is heavy fighting near Khowst, on the Jalalabad front the rebels are gathering their forces for another assault on the city, and missiles and shells are exploding in the streets of Herat and Qandahar....

The coup attempt by former Defense Minister Shahnawaz Tanay has exacerbated the situation. As noted at the Council of Ministers session held under the leadership of S.A. Keshtmand, chairman of the Executive Committee, during the operation to rout the putschists, apart from soldiers, 95 peaceful inhabitants died and 172 people were wounded. The presidential palace was seriously damaged, the "Pol-e Heshti" mosque and buildings where the Defense Ministry and Afghan Army Main Political Directorate are located were destroyed, and 230 privately owned stores and 55 houses were completely destroyed.

"The attempted mutiny cost us dear," Lieutenant General Z. Ziyarmal [name as transliterated], chief of the

Afghan Army Main Political Directorate, said to me. "There is no justification for this crime against the people, the party, and the army. To the credit of our apparatus, none of the political workers sided with Shahnawaz Tanay. Now a few groups of political workers numbering more than 70 people have been sent to the worst trouble spots' in the country—Khowst, Jalalabad, and Bagram. They are doing everything to help the commanders of the local garrisons to stabilize the situation."

However painful the events connected with the 6 March plot, the Afghan Armed Forces, Ziyarmal said, a year after the Soviet troops' withdrawal, have proved to the entire world that they can defend their country independently. The rebels' combat losses last year were 10 times greater than the number of government troops killed and wounded. After the rout of the rebels near Jalalabad, the morale of the armed opposition fell sharply. The regions controlled by the rebels are now a motley assortment of "emirates" and "fiefdoms" headed by local princelings who maintain their power through fear and violence. They only shelter beneath the banners of particular parties whose leaders are entrenched in Peshawar and Tehran. And, of course, they do not want to give up their power on any account.

During this time, Ziyarmal stressed, about 30,000 "fighters" and many field commanders along with their detachments, recognizing the policy of national reconciliation, went over to our side. The Afghans crave peace. The restoration of tranquillity and the country's rebirth are the main aims of the national reconciliation policy proclaimed by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and consistently implemented by the Afghan leadership and President Najibullah. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for its vigorous support of this policy in the international arena, and for the invaluable economic aid which we continue to receive.

Reports are now reaching Kabul from the country's provinces sharply condemning the conspiracy and supporting the country's leadership. In the Afghan capital itself a rally in which more than 10,000 Kabul people took part was held at the city stadium. They condemned the organizers of the unsuccessful putsch and expressed their willingness to help in every possible way to implement the policy of national reconciliation.

Afghan Shiites' Conference Held in Tehran

NC1503165990 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Interview with Commentator Aleksandr Batyev—Batyev statements are recorded in Russian with superimposed Persian translation followed by announcer-read Persian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Please pay attention to the remarks of Aleksandr Batyev our commentator. We requested his comment on the convocation of the Assembly of the Afghan Shiites in Tehran, which is being held for the first time there under the auspices of the Iranian Foreign Ministry. The leaders of the armed Afghan opposition groups based in Iran, as well as the military commanders of these armed groups who had arrived in Tehran from Afghanistan, participated in this assembly.

[Batyev] This assembly is held as the spring-summer season begins, during which the flames of war in Afghanistan usually reach their peak. Most experts believe that the approaching season will be a fateful one in the struggle between the groups involved in internecine clashes. According to present indications, the Afghan Shiites are trying to unite all their forces. The programs for convening elections which are being formulated by the so-called brothers of the Shiite groups of the opposition coalition are a source of deep apprehension for them. These elections are the ones to be held by the opposition coalition stationed in the Pakistani city of Peshawar. They have set up the so-called interim government of Afghanistan, but there are not enough seats allocated for the Shiite opposition groups. Now the Shiites are again worried that the same discrimination will take place.

[Announcer] How will they act in this regard?

[Batyev] First of all, as I said earlier, the Shiite groups are seeking to unite and on the other hand, who knows whether they have (?secret) contacts with the Najibullah government in Kabul. At present there are such contacts, this fact being proven by the relatively smaller military operations in the Iran-Afghanistan region compared to movements in the regions in the proximity of Pakistan. It is for this reason that there used to be a restriction, a special taboo among the Afghan opposition, on cooperation with Kabul, which hindered more durable ties.

However, some time ago, Gulbuddin Hikmatyar violated this restriction. I am referring to his collaboration with the rebel General Shahnawaz Tanay in staging the government coup d'etat which ended in failure in the Afghan capital. In this manner, if Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, who is known for being intensely unable to reconcile with Kabul, can take such a step, what is there to prevent the so-called creditable groups of Afghanistan, of which the Iran- based groups are a part, from taking a similar measure?

The fact is that I wish to stress that all the above are my personal observations. The correctness of these observations will only be known in the near future.

Nothing New in Bhutto Statement on Afghanistan

LD1603003290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar—TASS Political Observer Askold Biryukov writes:

I will confess that, initially, I was pleased when I became familiar with one of the statements by Benazir Bhutto, the prime minister of Pakistan, at a press conference

which took place in Islamabad on Wednesday. "The time has come for brave new initiatives directed toward a resolution of the Afghan problem," the head of the Pakistani government declared. However, the more one familiarizes oneself with the text of her speech, the more one feels disappointment; neither new nor brave initiatives are contained in it. The impression given is that one and the same decrepit recipes for resolving a very acute problem are being put forward in Islamabad under a new sauce, recipes which cannot lead either to national reconciliation or to a political settlement in Afghanistan.

The agruments used by the prime minister of Pakistan have been heard several times already. And what is more, they did not ensue from Islamabad but from Washington. Literally on the eve of the press conference, the 'NEW YORK TIMES' wrote that the Afghan rebels were demanding that Najibollah and his entourage should give up power, and the United States supports this demand, although the administration has stated that his departure may be part of a gradual process and be effected through negotiation. The newspaper draws attention to the fact that Washington is still conducting a double policy by employing military pressure through the partisans, and urging a political settlement in the talks with the Soviet Union.

But what is Bhutto saying? According to her, Pakistan has always called for a peaceful political settlement of the Afghan problem, which may be achieved through the creation of a widely representative government that reflects the interests of all strata in Afghan society. "Let's turn to the people of Afghanistan. Let's ask them what they want," the prime minister declares. But surely it is clear what the people of Afghanistan want. They do not just want peace, but thirst of it. It is for precisely that reason that they are adopting an increasingly understanding attitude toward Kabul's policy of national reconciliation, and are refusing to support the ringleaders of the "irreconcilables", who are squabbling among themselves for spheres of influence and power.

As for a peaceful political and the creation within the country of a widely representative government that reflects the interests of all strata in Afghan society, it is precisely this that the Najibullah government is urging, and urging consistently, calling for an inter-Afghan dialogue without any discrimination, and with the participation of all Afghans, both inside and outside the country. The USSR also shares this approach. Why try to break down an open door, as they say,and demand that the Soviet Union should "revise its approach to the problem"?

The prime minister maintains that Pakistan "shows favor to none of the sides in the Afghan conflict". But at the same press conference, she lavished praise on the so-called "interim government of Afghanistan", knocked together with the direct participation of the Pakistani authorities. She said that Pakistan was giving it all possible assistance, and believes that this "government" is "on the right road". Moreover, Bhutto acknowledged that Islamabad is simply not ready for a peaceful political settlement. "We cannot as yet see any possibility of a cessation of arms deliveries or of a cease-fire in Afghanistan, but we consider that these questions must be tackled jointly." We shall recall in this connection that the door for joint decisions is open. Kabul and Moscow have long been ready for this. It is now necessary that Pakistan, too, should display boldness and political will.

Prospects After Afghan Coup Attempt Assessed

PM1503110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Special correspondent Yu. Glukhov dispatch: "Will Peace Return to Afghanistan? Settlement Prospects and Impasses"]

[Text] Kabul, Mar—How difficult it is to mend the torn fabric of peace! How hard it is to put an end to a conflict, particularly a long and bloody one. You ponder this when you visit Afghanistan.

Admittedly, the groundwork for peace has already been carried out. Considerable groundwork. The Geneva agreements have been signed. Not only signed, but also fulfilled by Kabul and Moscow. There is the whole series of peace initiatives submitted by the republic's president, Najibullah, as one possible way of settling the conflict. Finally, there are the Soviet proposals set out by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze.

Nonetheless, the national reconciliation policy is faltering. Moreover, surprises which drastically complicate the situation are arising. I am referring to the recent putsch by Defense Minister Tanay, now ex-defense minister. I met him while I was collecting material for this report. The Defense Ministry, housed in Chekhelsutun [name as transliterated] Palace, was dark and deserted. A heavy and—as is now clear—conspiratorial atmosphere reigned there. During the meeting Tanay painted an optimistic picture of the Afghan Army's increased combat effectiveness in the fight against the opposition. How should those assessments be amended now that the fugitive minister is betraying military secrets, consorting with the rebels, and urging the armed forces to "continue resistance with the help of the "mujahidin"? How will the treachery on the part of this party member and member of the Khalq faction affect relations within the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], where there is still friction between the "Parcham" and "Khalq" factions?

"A split is the main danger for us," I have frequently heard these words from PDPA functionaries and rank-and-file members. Their fears are well founded. There have already been four changes of leadership since the April Revolution. Intraparty clashes have often taken a bloody turn. The military putsch is a link in the same ominous chain. Even though it was suppressed, its costs are quite tangible for Afghanistan on both the domestic

and the international fronts. The conspirators played into the hands of those people who oppose a peaceful settlement.

Is there any way out of the Afghan maze at the present stage? Are the positions of the hostile camps not too diametrically opposed? Can people operating under the red flag on the one hand and the green flag of Islam on the other find a common language? I tried to find answers to these questions during my meetings in Kabul. Here are the opinions of representatives of various Afghan circles.

S. La'eq, PDPA Central Committee secretary and minister of border affairs:

There are many points of rapprochement. Some opposition representatives, for instance, have not lost their sense of patriotism. In this case the desire to uphold independence and national sovereignty and revive our country form the common ground. The fact that this process should occur on a democratic basis, from central to district organs, could also be common ground. Everyone has grown tired of war and the demand for a cease-fire is becoming common ground.

Western propaganda depicts the authorities in Kabul as a Communist regime. That is a distortion of the facts. The PDPA's program is a program of national democracy. Think about the party's very name—People's Democratic Party, that is, party of the people and democracy. I would add that it is also the party of Afghanistan's Muslims. I believe that religion, national traditions, and customs are another element uniting us with the opposition.

So the national reconciliation policy constitutes our tactics and strategy.

Unfortunately, our proposals have still not been answered. There are several reasons for this. Some opposition leaders, for instance, are operating at someone else's bidding.

The United States espouses an obstructionist position. If it is really interested in peace, it must stop its interference in Afghan affairs, not encourage Pakistan, and also establish contacts with the Afghan leadership. The time for war is past. The policy of common sense and new thinking is gaining the upper hand. Are we really not entitled to participate in this process? Afghanistan is a sovereign state.

It is not impossible that Washington is waiting for a puppet government obedient to its wishes to be set up in Afghanistan. Vain expectations. There are no preconditions for that. In this connection it is wrong to compare the USSR's aid with Western interference in Afghanistan's affairs. This is an insult to both the Afghan and Soviet peoples. Parallels between the Afghan war and the war in Vietnam are inadmissible. Unlike American soldiers, Soviet soldiers did not come as aggressors.

Afghan Deputy Prime Minister Amanuddin Amin, a nonparty person who joined the coalition government based on the national reconciliation policy:

Peace must be founded on realities. Neither of side must foist its viewpoint on the other or insist on its own terms. It is not important which party or which person takes charge of this process. The resolution of the problem depends on the Afghans. At the same time the USSR and the United States can promote a settlement, influence Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and those who are interfering in Afghan affairs, and enable us to resolve our problems.

The PDPA must be a party to the talks, A. Amin continued. The United States and the opposition still reject this. Strictly speaking, the PDPA has made mistakes and is paying for them. Extremists, Islamic fundamentalists, and left-wing radicals, who have closed ranks in their desire for war, must be excluded from both sides. The problems must be resolved by moderates, through dialogue. If the opposition is unwilling for direct contacts with the Afghan Government or the PDPA, the services of an intermediary, the United Nations, for instance, could be employed. Actions in support of peace must not be propagandist.

The king could play a role in the attainment of peace.

In general new leaders must come along and the incumbent government must go. I do not think that Afghanistan should become a second Iran. I personally see no future for the fundamentalists. The people do not support extremists.

As for external conditions, "negative symmetry"—the renunciation of weapons shipments to the warring sides—must be implemented.

The continuation of the war, which is what U.S. policy is driving at, means more and more casualties. This is being done in the hope of creating an anti-Soviet bridgehead. Has the United States forgotten the case of Iran? The same gamble was made there. How did it all end? With the seizure of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. It is a mistake to kindle a fratricidal war and support fundamentalists. Ultimately they may close ranks with Iran and turn against the "Great Satan."

Both extremist wings must be severed—that is the viewpoint held by Muhammad Eshaq Kawa, minister of mines in the present government and member of the Revolutionary Organization of Afghanistan. Indeed, the Tanay putsch also demonstrated the alignment between extremists who would seem to be at opposite ends of the spectrum.

There are now people, Kawa continued, who are profiting from the war. They are reluctant to return to peaceful life and must leave the political arena. Center forces, the great mass, ultimately should win. Najibullah expresses that trend.

It will undoubtedly take time—maybe a whole historical period—to wipe out the traces of the war and heal the wounds. But I take an optimistic view of the future, Kawa said. Disarmament is what may ease the Afghan tragedy. Considering the Afghans' bellicose nature, military arsenals must be cut back.

The Society of National Salvation headed by Prof. Muhammad Asgar, minister of justice and mayor of Kabul under Zahir Shah, is also contributing to the overall settlement process.

No side in the Afghan conflict, he believes, can win victory over the other. A peaceful solution is the only way out.

In his opinion, there are favorable external conditions. The main one being the policy of new thinking implemented by M. Gorbachev and the new political climate in the world.

The actions of the Society of National Salvation aim to awaken the silent majority. Its second task is to restore the trust that has been lost.

Asgar actively supports the king's involvement in a peace settlement. He believes that political pluralism without any one party predominating is necessary. A one-party system is possible, but only if it is established democratically.

Asgar says that any system must recognize Afghan cultural, moral, and religious values. It must correspond with 20th century realities. I personally do not believe, he continued, that Afghanistan will be fundamentalist. The world has changed and we must keep pace with progress.

Well-known Afghan journalists Zahir Tanin and Abdallah Shadan believe that it is necessary to overcome the polarization of society, the antagonism between the warring camps, and the antagonism between the United States and the USSR. It is necessary to overcome fear and realize that the reconciliation program is not a fraud. It is necessary to elaborate a settlement mechanism and a comprehensive approach that takes internal and external factors into consideration.

It is also hard for the PDPA to adapt to new conditions. In its 25-year history the party has held only one congress—its constituent congress. Party organization secretaries were appointed, not elected. Of course, the military situation has also made its mark. How will the party fit into a period of peace? I heard the opinion voiced that the adaptation process is being dragged out. The Tanay conspiracy is an alarming symptom. A split in and the weakening of the PDPA would indisputably undermine the peace efforts.

At the same time one gets the impression that an excessive ideological overtone has been imparted to the Afghan conflict. But Afghanistan is neither communist, as Western propaganda makes out, nor fundamentalist. Leaving aside the pseudo-ideological aspect, the war in Afghanistan is between Afghans and Afghans, between Muslims and Muslims. Both sides have nothing against cooperating and maintaining normal relations with both the USSR and the United States. In my opinion, patriotism, loyalty to national interests, and, in this specific situation, the struggle to ensure peace for the long-suffering Afghan people could above all be the criteria for assessing actions. There is scope for competition here—a competition in which the Afghan opposition has not yet proved its worth.

Islamic 'Fundamentalism' in Egypt Viewed

NC1503215890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] We want to devote this part of our program to the problems of Islamic fundamentalism in Egypt—the largest country in the Arab world. The reason for this is the situation in al-Minya Province in upper Egypt where the police arrested 11 Islamic activists.

These arrests came after religious unrest during which the houses and shops of a Christian sect of Egypt were destroyed. Four of the sect's churches were set on fire. Of course, there were human losses during the unrest, but Egypt's Interior Minister Muhammad 'Abd al-Halim Musa was silent about this.

I recall many of the bloody incidents in Asyut, even though these incidents took place 10 years ago. At that time the murder and plunderings of the members of this Christian sect assumed the proportions of a full-scale war. The number of people wounded and killed during these incidents at that time were tens and hundreds.

Apparently at that time, when extinguising the major fire, the government officials left cinders beneath the ashes. For example, this is what Professor Milad Hannah of Egypt's Nation Research Center on Problems of the Near East thinks:

[Begin Hannah recording, superimposed by Persian translation] Religious relations in Egypt stem from its socioeconomic situation both in the country and outside its borders. At that time—10 years ago—the government was able to solve the problem somewhat using police methods. But it was unable to discern the reasons for this crisis until the end. The possibility of a repetition of such incidents continues to exist both in Asyut and anywhere else. The number of fundamentalists in Egypt is not high. But if the government continues to fall short in solving economic problems, then a division of the society into leftist and rightist poles will start. But since the leftists do not have a great influence in Egypt, the people will turn toward the fundamentalists. [end recording]

Incidents proved Professor Hannah's remarks to be true. Egypt's Interior Minister General Musa also emphasized that the fundamentalists exploited the complicated economic situation in al- Minya intentionally. Thus the

threat of fundamentalism—the threat from the rightists in Egypt—is very genuine. This threat is more genuine since there are two religions in the country. Ten percent of the Egyptians do not pray in mosques, but in churches. Thus if religious hostility is not impeded seriously, it will threaten the entire Egyptian nation with discord and will shake the government. This will undoubtedly affect the situation in the Arab world because Egypt is Egypt—the largest country in the Arab world.

The intention here is not to criticize Egypt's security organs in any way. Astonishingly they are acting very decisively and effectively. But the police force's options are not unlimited. The police cannot solve socioeconomic problems; and this is not its job. The problem of fundamentalism in contemporary Egypt is more social than religious in nature. Professor Hannah says:

[Begin Hannah recording in Arabic, superimposed with Persian translation] This is a social, and first and foremost, political problem and if the government and the National Democratic Party had a decisive program to solve the social problem, the fundamentalists would continue to remain a small group. [end recording]

Sub-Saharan Africa

Tanzanian Prime Minister Meets Soviet Delegation

LD0903214190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1114 GMT 9 Mar 90

[Text] Dar-es-Salaam, 9 Mar (TASS)—Joseph Warioba, first vice president and prime minister of the United Republic of Tanzania, today received the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation which is here on a visit, led by Yu.I. Borodin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for Public Health.

During the conversation that took place, the Tanzanian leader showed a lively interest in the processes under way in the Soviet Union. The fact that, while following the road of reform, the USSR remains true to the principles of socialism causes deep satisfaction, J. Warioba said.

While commenting the traditionally friendly relations between the USSR and Tanzania in the political field, the sides stressed the need to further develop and improve trade and economic ties. It was noted, moreover, that the latest changes in Tanzania's external economic policy and reforms in the USSR create favorable conditions for this.

An exchange of views also took place concerning the latest events in the southern African region. The unity of assessments of the situation taking shape there was noted.

Mandela's Stockholm Statements Assessed

MB1503210090 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Igor Potovskiy commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] On his first trip outside Africa following his release, the deputy president of the African National Congress [ANC], Nelson Mandela, appealed to the world community in Stockholm to step up sanctions against Pretoria and to break off diplomatic relations with it.

Commentary is by Igor Potovskiy:

One must admit that Mr. Mandela's call sounds a discordant note in the overall atmosphere of hopeful, quick, and favorable development of events.

What is behind his statement?

Foreign Minister Roelof Botha said on this score that he does not know what Mr. Mandela wants to achieve by calls to isolate South Africa, and (?anyway) such statements were doing the government of South Africa no harm.

It is difficult to say how justified such an unequivocal and confident reaction is. On the whole, political processes in South Africa are moving in a direction which may potentially result, if not in a stalemate, in great complication.

At present, the prospects of democracy in South Africa depend not so much on President de Klerk's intentions, as they do on many other factors, the main being the pressure the president is exposed to from the well organized conservatives with influence in state structures, specifically the security agencies, on the one hand, and the fragmented, unorganized, but potentially powerful democratic movement on the other.

Everything depends on whose influence will prove stronger. The president himself is forced to balance between the two and steer as close to the center as possible. He has to keep an eye on the right wing and make concessions to the left.

Mr. Mandela's position is no less complex. He has to unite the disunited forces of the opponents of the incumbent system, regardless of all the differences that exist between them.

What the president requires (?is) to keep the changes going, achieve quick and positive results to the reforms he has announced. He needs a let-up of the sanctions if he wants to start negotiations with the opposition. That could (?allay) the displeasure of the right wing.

Actually, that is what Nelson Mandela needs, too. But, he also needs time.

In any case, judging by what Mr. Mandela himself said, he can (?win) the right to participate in negotiations with the government, especially as the leader of the ANC

delegation at the ANC conference, which is due only in June. He needs time to assert his position as leader among the divided, warring black organizations, otherwise the outcome of the negotiations with the government would not be favorable for the ANC. That is being taken into consideration, no doubt.

But, there is a danger that the president may remain along with the right wing, and Mr. Mandela's statement in Stockholm on the need for stronger pressure on Pretoria, on stronger sanctions, and diplomatic isolation does not make prospects for Mr. de Klerk any easier. Neither will the ANC win [words indistinct] the only reasonable explanation for Mr. Mandela's Stockholm statement is the striving to fill the time vacuum, to counterpose outside pressure on the president to the right wing pressure. In any case, for [words indistinct] the ANC needs to unite supporters under its own banner.

But, this appears to be too complex a political construction to be viable, more so as the first reaction to Mr. Mandela's statement in the West was negative.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Eastern Europe

LD1503164290 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Now highlights of an interview granted by the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, to the Moscow-based weekly OGONEK.

Speaking about the current processes in countries of central and Eastern Europe, Eduard Shevardnadze said that Moscow had due knowledge of the processes from the very start. Moscow was aware of sentiments in society. And how can one be deluded in this case in general when in 1953 in the German Democratic Republic, in 1956 in Hungary, and in 1968 in Czechoslovakia there already were explosions of popular discontent and anger caused by forcing history, violating democracy, traditions, the way of life, and finally acting against common sense.

Among the many explanations of the latest events in the countries of central and Eastern Europe, added the Soviet foreign minister, there are well-found ones in my opinion. The wave of democratic renewal in these countries was triggered by fears for a breakdown of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. There was the fear that perestroyka would be stopped, and everything would become as it used to be, including former doctrines and the order in the country—the fear that Soviet troops and arms would remain for good in these countries, that there would remain the tradition to teach, guide, and interfere in internal affairs, to bring matters to a crash, and disintegration of the economies of these states along a totally discredited path of pseudo socialism.

This path was not in the interests of the USSR. I am deeply convinced, said Eduard Shevardnadze, that the Soviet Union is interested in a situation in which its neighbors are free, democratic, and prosperous states, equally open to both the West and the East, and not a situation when a cordon sanitaire is artificially created around the USSR out of doubtful and shaky regimes.

The Soviet Union is interested in the democratic nature of the social and political transformations in countries of central and Eastern Europe, not in the maintenance of power propped up by foreign, and one's own, bayonets.

Speaking about the German issue, the Soviet foreign minister said that the Soviet approach to it amounts to accepting an indisputable right of the Germans to self-determination. We realize well the feelings of the divided people and their desire to reunite. This is a natural course matters are taking. The right of other European peoples is as natural and indisputable to have safeguards for their secure future as they suffered a lot, just as the Soviet people did, from German militarism.

We are certain, said Eduard Shevardnadze, that a way out can be found with the help of the two-plus-four mechanism providing for the responsibility of the four great powers for the solution of the German issue. A way has been found to synchronize the movement toward German unity with the Helsinki process, and especially through forming structures of collective security in Europe. There is quite sufficient international accord on this score.

Some time later the Soviet leadership intends to outline its views (?of) principle on all the problems related to German unity. When foam appearing on the crest of waves of renewal defiles monuments of the fallen for the liberation of the continent from fascism, noted Eduard Shevardnadze further, I feel not only pain, but concern too. And I am duty bound to do my best for the too-obvious current specters of German national chauvinism not to take flesh and blood so (?as) neither today nor at any time in the future united Germany does not threaten peace. [sentence as heard]

Eduard Shevardnadze has accepted the view that if perestroyka in the USSR fails, anarchy will come to the country, and that is total breakdown of the state. (?What) if another thing happens which is rather more real—a dictator will assume power? It is not ruled out that such variants may shape also in the countries of Eastern Europe or in the united Germany. For this not to happen we must have the time to come to terms one with another about security in Europe. We should force this process. Though again to do that we need domestic stability and a relatively calm life. These things are now the guarantee of success, stressed the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, in his interview for the Moscow-based weekly OGONEK.

Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Polish Envoy

LD1503200490 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today received Polish Ambassador to the Soviet Union Stanislaw Ciosek.

Some issues of Soviet-Polish relations came up for discussion.

When international problems were discussed, much attention was given to external aspects of the construction of German unity. In this connection both sides confirmed the need of continuing a Soviet-Polish dialogue on German problems.

Romanian Academic Cited on Economic Policy

PM1503134390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Single Edition p 3

[Dispatch by V. Samoshkin citing Academician A. Birladeanu, member of the Provisional Council for National Accord Executive Bureau: "The Romanian Economy: How To Get Out of the Crisis: Difficult Search"]

[Excerpt] Bucharest—[Passage omitted] What are the directions of strategic development of the Romanian economy and its immediate and long-term prospects? There is much argument and discussion in the press about this at present. The representatives of certain parties favor virtually the total denationalization of the economy, the extensive involvement of foreign capital, and the complete restoration of land to the peasants. Others advocate a more realistic and considered approach to these problems. Here is the opinion of Academician Aleksandru Birladeanu, member of the Provisional Council of National Accord Executive Bureau:

[Birladeanu] In the first place we should do away with the statization of the economy, the consequence of which is this coercive administrative-edict system. You cannot run an economy with bureaucrats, you can only do so with enterprising people. A person should be connected with the results of his labor, what he produces should belong to him.

But a problem arises: To whom should the enterprise belong? Here a special approach is necessary. There are sectors that are monopolist by nature—the railroads, the mails, the power industry, and others—and should remain in the state's hands. However, the activity of those enterprises should be subject to the laws of the market. Experience of this does exist in capitalist countries too, for example, Renault in France.

There are medium-sized enterprises where the workers themselves can become owners or where part of the enterprise will belong to the workers while the other part will belong to private capital. Enterprises can be leased to the collective; I am also in favor of setting up enterprises with the help of private capital.

The economic program planned by the government with the participation of representatives of various political parties shows a sober assessment of the actual situation and a substantial radicalization of the original plans of the former National Salvation Front Council. The program envisages the phased transition to a market economy, the main stages of which are to decentralize the economy and make enterprises autonomous.

For the general recovery and modernization of the economy the government is planning already at this present stage to attract foreign capital and new Western technologies, particularly in those sectors which are based upon their own resources such as, for example, the petroleum and gas extraction industries and promising machine building sectors. This involves Elf, Total, Siemens, Renault, and others. Measures have also been taken to revive old joint companies and ventures which ailed under the dictatorship and to set up new ones. The proportion of foreign capital involvement will be mandatorily limited to 49 percent. A plan to modernize the tourist industry (refurbishment of hotels, computerization, and road modernization) using $1 billion of EEC credit is being drawn up. This project is expected to guarantee a swift return.

As far as agriculture is concerned, the ways of developing it are a topic of particularly heated debate in the press and in the Provisional Council of National Accord.

Three decrees-cum-laws passed at the start of the year have substantially improved the peasantry's position. Many peasants and members of cooperatives have received plots of land for their personal use of 0.5 hectares per person. And the decrees envisage various grants of credit to peasants for the purchase of equipment, seed, and fertilizer. As far as the future of agricultural cooperatives is concerned, if they are profitable—and there are many such, particularly in stockraising and viticulture—there are no grounds for scrapping them. Cooperatives and individual farms are being freed from the state's supervision and are themselves determing the ambit of their agricultural concerns: What and how much they should sow.

Categorical demands to eliminate cooperatives and hand all the land to the peasants are being made by the so-called "historical" parties. The objection raised to them is that small peasant farms are unable to solve the food problem in the country. Even in the West it is the large farms, including cooperatives, that call the tune.

Prime Minister P. Roman has described the strike movement with its various economic demands as the paramount problem and task of all political parties. "The majority of these demands," he told a Provisional Council of National Accord session, "are perfectly just. We should pay the bills left by the dictatorship. But given the economic crisis, all production potential, whatever it

is, should work without interruption so that our great difficulties are not made even worse."

Albanian Minister Calls for Balkan Cooperation

18120044A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 3

[Text] Reiz Malile, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, has arrived in Bulgaria on an official visit. The time has come, declared Malile, for Balkan cooperation to enter a more concrete phase.

West Europe

Akhromeyev Queried; Discusses a Unified Germany

LD1403183990 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1206 GMT 14 Mar 90

["Text" of NOVOSTI interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, former chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces by NOVOSTI correspondent; date, place not given]

[Text] [NOVOSTI] From the Western point of view, united Germany ought to belong to NATO. What is you view? What do you think: Can the present GDR remain a member of the the Warsaw Pact if unification becomes reality?

[Akhromeyev] I believe that the future united Germany should not belong to any military alliance, not to NATO, and not to the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet Union opposes united Germany's membership in NATO because it does not support reinforcement of the military alliance of those states which have to date regarded it as their potential opponent. Naturally, new solutions must be found so that the future Germany will belong to no military alliance. Different options are possible. For instance, united Germany could be neutral. The USSR made that proposal immediately after the end of the Second World War. Between 1945-59 the Soviet Union backed a united, democratic, and neutral Germany.

Another solution is also possible, in which a united Germany is integrated into an organization which would be no opponent of the Soviet Union or of the United States, Great Britain, France or other European states. I believe that such a solution should be sought. Certainly, the representatives of the states at the two-plus-four conference will consider this.

[NOVOSTI] Will the Soviet Union be satisfied with the vague promise from the FRG, that in the event of the unification of the FRG and the GDR, that it will not station its troops on East German territory?

[Akhromeyev] A promise by the FRG or even the United States and other states in the event of the unification of the two German states to station no troops on the territory of the GDR cannot satisfy us. First, these are only promises. Second, even if the NATO bloc were to make such a declaration, we would not receive the necessary guarantees.

The experiences of history are very instructive here. After the signing of the Treaty of Versailles a demilitarized Rhine zone was established (from the French and Belgian borders to the Rhine). In 1936, however, fascist Germany violated these regulatiosn and occupied the Rhineland. We all know what happened then... I do not believe that such a promise by the FRG can serve as a sure basis fof a guarantee of the security of the Soviet Union. One must not overlook the fact that U.S. tactical nuclear weapons are stationed on FRG territory and that in the event of the unification of Germany they will not disappear of their own accord from West European soil. This problem will also have to be solved somehow. Even if one takes the demilitarization of the GDR as the starting point, the territory of the FRG would still be packed with these weapons. In brief, this prospect is unaceptable to us.

[NOVOSTI] Do you consider it expedient in the present international situation for both military alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Pact organization—to dispense with their military functions and transform themselves into political organizations? According to U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, the U.S. troops on the continent of Europe continue to be regarded as a pledge for the security of the West and as a stabilizing factor in this region. Perhaps it would be worth it for us to take a unilateral step, that is to say, to carry out the self-dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and thus make the presence of U.S. troops in Europe superfluous?

[Akhromeyev] Too often people suggest to us that we should dissolve something, that is to say, undertake unilateral security. It does not take into account our justified concern about preserving the security of states. On this basis one could reduce the armed forces and arms and the military budgets on both sides. In this way equal security would be guaranteed for both sides.

Also realistic is a step in which adequate security is achieved by means of reducing the military functions of the two military alliances. However the NATO bloc states have not so far taken this up, even though we have long since proposed a discussion on transforming the two alliances. At present, NATO does not even want to change its military doctrine, let alone take more radical decisions. By contrast the Soviet Union has undoubtedly demonstrated sufficient good will and has adopted numerous unilateral commitments in order to bring real disarmament out of the impasse. Today, as you can see, it is up to the West in negotiations on this disarmament. I am hopeful about the Vienna negotiations, the results of which can strongly promote the raising of overall European security.

[NOVOSTI] What is your attitude to the fact that the modernization of the American strategic triad is proceeding at full speed? None of the systems planned as far

back as Carter have been dropped from the production program. In the case of strategic offensive weapons, it is planned to reduce those which in fact only have a minimal influence on reducing nuclear first-strike capability, even though we assume that there will be no such strike.

On the other hand we are being urged to reduce precisely those systems whose reduction weaken the potential for counterattack. Is such a position logical? What do you think of this?

[Akhromeyev] I cannot accept your premise that a future treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons will have only a minimal effect on the sides' strategic potential. The 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons, which also include on both sides land-based ICBMs, sea-launched ballistic missiles, and strategic bombers, is after all an important and tangible step towards reducing tensions and increasing security. Of course every negotiating partner pursues his own aims. The Americans want an agreement on the reduction of armaments to 1,600 carriers and 6,000 warheads, to virtually confirm their superiority in the number of warheads, when one takes into account their superiority in sea-based long-range Cruise missiles. As regards the development of strategic offensive weapons, all types of the new U.S. strategic systems developed over the past few years have gone into series production. At the same time attempts are being undertaken to put us under pressure not to modernize our strategic arms. Why should we not renew them, however, when the United States is doing so? We have nowhere promised anyone that we would have more outdated strategic armaments than the United States. All agreements affecting this type of arms are strictly adhered to by the Soviet Union, which is conscientiously conducting negotiations on their reduction. The U.S. accusations against us are totally unfounded.

Here it is appropriate to refer to the issue of long-range air- and sea-based Cruise missiles. If this type of weapon is not limited, there will be no treaty on strategic offensive weapons. This is the position of the USSR. It must at all costs be limited, otherwise the treaty will not be signed. The sides taking part in the Geneva negotiations on nuclear space weapons realize this and are seeking mutually acceptable solutions. The treaty will only be signed when it satisfies the USSR and the United States.

It is probable that negotiations on a further reduction of strategic offensive weapons will begin this year.

[NOVOSTI] But 6,000 warheads are a lot. Does this not mean dropping the issue of first-strike capacity from the agenda, since the potential is virtually maintained?

[Akhromeyev] But what do you suggest? The agreement to reduce it to this level, at any rate as an initial measure, exists.

[NOVOSTI] I would suggest a moratorium on the modernization of strategic offensive weapons for a period in which negotiations are conducted, and until new negotiations start on the second part of the strategic offensive weapons remaining on both sides.

[Akhromeyev] Go ahead, suggest it. Up to now no one has made such a suggestion at the negotiations.

[NOVOSTI] Do you rule out such a possibility?

[Akhromeyev] You know, you want to hold up progress. I think it is impossible.

[NOVOSTI] But it affects armaments....

[Akhromeyev] Scientific progress cannot be halted anywhere. It is not dependent on our wishes. That is an objective manifestation. One has to make realistic proposals.

New Military Radio Program Features Germany

LD1303184890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1140 GMT on 13 March carries a new program entitled "Armed Forces and Society." This program lasts for 20 minutes and is presented by journalist Aleksandr Korshunov. He starts by saying that this is a new program and the team that has prepared it pins great hopes on it. "I would describe the main idea of the program by the formula: The World and Arms. We will meet with you twice a month and will speak about problems on which our society has been absolutely clearly divided. They arouse many arguments, controversies and even seemingly irreconcilable antagonisms. They include the problems of our state security, disarmament, the future of the USSR Armed Forces, and their role within and outside the country in the past and future. Scientists, diplomats, journalists, and parliamentaries from our country and abroad will be your interlocutors. But we invite you, esteemed listeners, to become interlocutors and partners, too. Not a single letter from you concerning the problems raised will be neglected. A proportion of our time will be devoted to a letter review which will play the role of a rostrum for public opinion. Besides, in our next program on 27 March, the time and telephone numbers by which you can reach us and speak directly with the authors of programs will be announced."

Korshunov goes on to say that recently the first event of its kind took place in the village of Planernoye: an independent public expert's meeting devoted to determining the level of the threat faced by the Soviet Union and the Armed Forces today. It was attended by 150 people including people's deputies, diplomats, lawyers, scientists, military officers, teachers, doctors, and engineers.

Aleksey Borisovich Pankin, chairman of the Organizational Committee of the independent public expert's

meeting and deputy editor in chief of the MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN magazine, takes over. He speaks about the aims of their gathering in Planerskoye—to give a voice to alternative views on military problems—and sums up the content of discussions. The Soviet Union's lagging behind in the quality of armaments, compared to the West, was noted there. At the same time, the present state of the Soviet economy makes it impossible for the country to attain the same qualitative level. Pankin quotes one of many letters he has received from Soviet servicemen, in which some faults of Soviet Army structures are highlighted. Initially, most participants in the meeting favored the creation of a professional army but, following lengthy discussions, their enthusiasm for the idea somewhat subsided. Pankin lists some of the arguments for and against a professional army; the events in Romania, where the professional army remained loyal to Ceaucescu, was among the "against" arguments. Pankin concludes by saying that first we have to decide what kind of society we want to build and only then one should apply the corresponding criteria to the army.

Korshunov invites foreign political commentator Viktor Levin, who is in the studio, to take up the conversation and to speak about the problems raised by Pankin in the light of the impending German reunification. Levin says: "Many people are asking now whether a united Germany might pose a threat to these processes [of strengthening European security], what role Germany is going to play in the all-European process and what place it will occupy in the military-political group that exist today. There are several different views on this account, and let us look into possible options. The first option: a united Germany, a single Germany joins the Warsaw Pact. The issue is quite logical. If the West can raise the question of a united Germany joining NATO, then the question arises of why it cannot be a pact member-country.

[Korshunov] This option cannot be discarded!

[Levin] Certainly. But it is pretty clear to anybody that the incorporation of a united Germany in the pact will badly undermine the principle of stability, as this will strengthen very considerably the pact at NATO's expense. Now let us take another option, the option that, in fact, Western powers are vigorously trying to impose upon us: A united Germany as a NATO member-country. But in this case, the pact will be a losing side. Of course, the GDR is not as powerful as the FRG but, nevertheless, it is an integral part of the pact, and anything detrimental to this organization will be to the benefit of NATO. Consequently, such an option is absolutely unacceptable to us, socialist countries, in my view, and we have made a very clear-cut statement on this subject. Statements have been made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze to the effect that a united Germany should in no way become a NATO member. One must say that very powerful and influential political forces in both German states have shown great understanding for that. There are statements made by Hans Modrow, head of the GDR current Government, by the Party for Democratic Socialism, the GDR Social Democratic Party, which incidentally, is active in the FRG as the German Social Democratic Party, saying that a united Germany and the process of German unification in general should be very closely tied with the all- European process. This is not a simple question, I understand this perfectly well, but it must be solved in such a way that the security interests of any of the sides or military-political groups be not encroached upon.

"[Korshunov] Viktor Nikolayevich, this problem has yet another aspect. Recently, I read an opinion expressed by West European experts maintaining that even if the future Germany is not included within NATO's or the pact's framework, its development toward assuming the role of a large military power, even a super power, cannot be excluded. Alongside, the fairly recent decision of the Western European Union abolishing all the restrictions on the production by Germany of strategic weapons, including heavy bombers and aircraft carriers, is being mentioned.

[Levin] No doubt, such a threat exists. I, for example, am worried by the fact that a whole range of West German political figures and Chancellor Kohl voice such words and statements which clearly indicate that greater German ambitions are on the rise. Kohl already treats the GDR as a state that does not exist. He completely tramples upon its sovereignty. Things have gone so far that at a recent election rally in Rostock he called upon the electors to overthrow the communist leaders. You see, GDR citizens themselves should determine their attitude to their leaders. There are very diferent ones among them [the leaders] and I think that far from all of them command respect; one cannot, however, interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. Various theses are following one another in Kohl's arguing but all these theses revolve around precisely such, very worrying tendencies. A new thesis has emerged: the processes of unification should develop within the framework of Article 23 of the FRG Basic Law. This implies, in essence, that this should be not a process of uniting two sovereign and equal states but a process of the GDR being engulfed by the FRG.

"[Korshunov] A sort of automatic annexation?

[Levin] It is an Anschluss. It is a fairly distinctive political concept. In 1938 Hitler's Germany engulfed Austria and that was described by the same word—Anschluss. So, in this area, a whole range of measures and guarantees should be drafted ensuring such a development of events in Germany, in a united Germany, which would prevent any possibility of it becoming a threat to other states. For this purpose, properly speaking, the conference '2 + 4' has been envisaged. The right of Germans to unification cannot be called in question, this is clear. But responsibility for the future of the world is, too, a factor inseparable from this unification. Coming back to the subject of military threat, I

would like to stress once again that the plans for incorporating a single Germany into NATO do not correspond to these tasks. They can aggravate threat in Europe."

Korshunov concludes the program by previewing the next edition of "Armed Forces and Society," which will include conversations with representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for defense and state security and a discussion with representatives of the U.S. Navy.

Commentator Scrutinizes German Unification

LD1403162690 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] The German question is now the centerpiece of world politics. Talks on it are beginning in Bonn under the two-plus-four formula. Involved are two German states and the four powers that won World War II: the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has come out with a special statement on the problems of German unification. Viktor Glazunov comments.

[Glazunov in Russian with superimposed English translation] The decision to settle the German question with the help of the two-plus-four formula was certainly wise. The process of unifying Germany should be based on respect for the interests of other countries. That the two-plus-four talks involve the two German states is understandable since they concern their unification. The participation of the four powers—Britain, the USSR, the United States, and France is conditioned by their responsibility for Germany as a whole, first of all by the need to prevent German soil from serving as a source of threat to its neighbors.

Other countries might join the two-plus-four talks when their interests are under discussion. Poland's participation will be essential during negotiations on the guarantees for its western borders. It's common knowledge that West Germany officially calls to question Poland's western frontier. The need to prevent the process of German unification from upsetting European stability and the balance of interests on the continent is of particular concern. It can be ensured only if movement toward German unity and the process of European security are synchronized. Therefore this movement should be gradual, not stirred up artificially.

In the meantime there are grounds for concern in this area. Some have already likened this impetuous process of German rapprochment to a train moving faster than scheduled. Bonn obviously wants to confront other capitals with a fait accompli—witness the intention to invoke Article 23 of West Germany's Constitution, which allows for an automatic joining of the GDR to West Germany. what does Bonn want: unification or absorption? And what about West Germany's international commitments? Will they be automatically spread to the GDR, too? Will the GDR join NATO automatically? Moreover, Article 23 allows for the possibility of making territorial claims to other European countries, and this is fraught with recarving the whole of Europe.

It's inadmissible to allow fateful issues concerning the entire continent to be resolved on the basis of West Germany's Constitution or other internal acts. The complicated questions of German unity must not be resolved hastily, onesidedly, arrogantly. This is fraught with disrupting positive processes occurring in Europe. A solution to the German question conducive to ensuring peace and cooperation in Europe can be gained solely by the joint efforts of all the parties concerned.

Representatives Exchange With Vatican Agreed

LD1503122790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar (TASS)—During their meeting in the Vatican on 1 December 1989, Mikhail Gorbachev and John Paul II agreed to impart an official character to relations between the USSR and the Vatican, with a view to facilitating the holding of direct dialogue on questions of mutual interest and to furthering useful Soviet-Vatican cooperation in the international sphere, the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate reported.

To this end, the Soviet Union and the Holy See have agreed to exchange official representatives, initially without permanent residences, correspondingly at the level of extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador and apostolic special nuncio.

Joint Venture With Italy Encounters Problems

PM1403130190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by F. Ivanov under the rubric "Follow-Up": "How the Idea of Selling Imported Goods for Rubles Burst"]

[Text] Imported goods worth $1 million intended for sale in Soviet stores have been under arrest by the customs office for several months. Your IZVESTIYA correspondent endeavored to find out how this could have happened.

IZVESTIYA (No. 365, 1989) wrote about how the "21st Century" Association, set up a year ago, was planning to open a chain of stores selling imported goods for rubles in Moscow and other cities in the country.

The joint venture "SI-21" was set up for this purpose; the foreign party involved was the major Italian concern "Italy Expo Est," which combines some 500 firms. It was planned that they would supply the Soviet market with high-quality industrial goods and foods. The joint venture's leaders intended to use the profits—which were going to amount to hundreds of millions of rubles—to

modernize outmoded canneries to enable them to produce output to world standards.

At that time, i.e. several months ago, the prospects seemed very alluring. Not without reason, the leaders of the association and the joint venture assured people that the first stores would open on the eve of the new year, 1990. However, March is upon us and not a single consignment of Italian goods has reached the market. Moreover, clothing worth approximately $1 million brought into the country in four heavy trailers is held up in customs. So what on earth has happened?

This is what A. Kikalishvili, president of the "21st Century" Association, had to say on the subject:

As soon as our joint venture "SI-21" began preparing to open its own stores, a fierce bureaucratic row broke out over this project. We were told by representatives of the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations and the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission that "SI-21" had not obtained the relevant authorization and so did not have the right to sell Italian goods for rubles. But how many people are you likely to find in our country who have free access to dollars?

We tried to set up a corresponding foreign trade firm under the auspices of "21st Century" but were refused permission to do this, the reason given being a resolution by I. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission, which prohibited the creation of this type of firm attached to a social organization. The strangest thing is that the creation of this type of firm has in fact been authorized by L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission for Economic Reform, but his signature apparently does not determine the actions of his subordinates.

During another visit to the State Foreign Economic Commission we were informed that "SI-21" could obtain the right to sell goods for rubles but that, for this to happen, we would have to provide a technical and economic feasibility study for the entire project. This was a reasonable demand and we were prepared to comply with it, but when in response we asked for a list of canneries so we could determine the possibilities for their modernization together with our Italian partners, the officials decided to keep silent.

All this has been going on for three months now. We ourselves do not understand the reason for the delay and are unable to explain to our partners why goods delivered to our country have still not gone on sale. We have no complaints against the customs officials—they have acted in strict accordance with instructions—but you must agree that this kind of confusion and indecisiveness could eventually undermine the confidence of any businessman in this specific project and also in the very idea of business cooperation with Soviet partners.... [Kikalishvili ends]

And here is a commentary by Yu. Znamenskiy, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission:

It is certainly true that we cannot at present authorize "SI-21" to sell goods for rubles. But this certainly does not mean that we have a biased attitude toward this joint venture. As yet we do not know how the profits will be used and where it is intended to invest them. Consequently, we have no guarantee that the Italian partner will not suddenly want to take this money out of the country, which poses the threat of our making large hard currency losses. We have asked the leaders of the joint venture on several occasions to provide a technical and economic feasibility study for the project, but nothing has been forthcoming so far. Considering the importance of this venture, we at least want to have a brief feasibility study of the project. As far as the list of canneries is concerned, we already have several plants we can recommend to "SI-21," and there will soon be more of them. We would like to hope that, when putting forward their demands, the leaders of the joint venture also take ours into account.... [Znamenskiy ends]

As it transpires, both sides have an interest in the successful realization of the project and there is a possibility for resolving the dispute. The only thing that we cannot understand is why the mediation of journalists is required in such cases to ensure that an agreement is reached on what are not, after all, particularly complicated matters. There are exceptions, of course. Two of the officials who have been holding up the opening of the stores all these months are Yu. Pekshev, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission, and V. Grinev, deputy head of one of the commission's departments. Representatives of "21st Century" and "SI-21" have held talks with them and it is they who gave the project the "red light." But—a rare inconsistency—these same principled people easily reached an agreement with representatives of the notorious ANT Association and gave the go-ahead for the sale of tanks. I do not think they needed journalists' mediation for that particular deal...

UK Trade Minister Visits, Holds Meetings

Biryukova Receives Ridley 13 Mar

PM1403141790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received N. Ridley, British minister of trade and industry—who is in our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government—and representatives of British business 13 March. During the talks, which were held in a businesslike

atmosphere, questions of the development of cooperation in the production of consumer goods, medicines, chemical fibers, and certain other spheres were examined.

Sitaryan Speaks With Ridley

LD1403135690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Before coming to the international news, a report on the talks between Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission, and Ridley, Great Britain's secretary of state for trade and industry. During the meeting a significant growth in the volume of reciprocal trade was noted. In the last three years, more than 80 Soviet-British joint enterprises have been created. At the same time the sides noted that what has been done is evidently insufficient given the possibilities the Soviet Union and Britain have for mutually advantageous trade. In this connection, specific steps were considered and mapped out, which could facilitate an expansion in trade and economic relations between our countries.

Ridley Holds News Conference

LD1603001490 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—"All has not yet been done politically to throw the doors wide open for trade and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Great Britain," British Secretary for Trade and Industry Nicholas Ridley told a news conference here today.

Ridley is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Soviet changes in the economy, the minister noted, create new opportunities for the development of mutually beneficial business ties. The British business community is showing an ever greater interest in the Soviet market and in bigger investments in the Soviet economy, including through joint ventures. The minister recalled that the commodity turnover between the two countries increased by 33 per cent last year and the number of joint ventures has reached more than 80.

However, the minister said, considerable difficulties still block the full-blooded development of all forms of trade and economic relations between the two countries. These difficulties, he said, include the inconvertibility of the rouble, insufficient currency resources of soviet enterprises and organizations, which have been granted the right to directly trade with foreign parnters and the slow rate of decision-making in Soviet organizations.

In closing, Ridley noted that politicians and business people of the two countries should display patience and persistence in the development of mutually beneficial cooperation. He pointed out that the high rate of political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union creates a favorable basis for this.

French Minister on Polish Border, German Unity

PM1403140590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "If the Germans Request It...."]

[Text] Bonn, 13 Mar—French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement pointed out the immutability of Poland's western border along the Oder-Neisse line in an interview with West German magazine DER SPIEGEL. "This border," he declared, "can be changed only by military means, but Europe is entitled to live in conditions of peace. Therefore the Polish border must be enshrined in an international act. This would be in line with Europe's interests, and consequently with the Germans' interests."

The minister recalled President F. Mitterrand's words to the effect that "the Germans' desire for unification is legitimate, but it must be implemented by peaceful and democratic means." The interests of Franco-German friendship, J.-P. Chevenement went on, demand that both sides avoid anything that could carry "overtones of arrogance or conceit." It is no secret that we found out about some important political decisions, like the 10-point unification plan or the intention to create a currency union, only from press reports, he noted.

Germany, J.-P. Chevenement went on to point out, is a powerful, real factor in the heart of Europe, and its unification would create serious problems. It would be in line with both sides' interests if these problems were to be openly discussed. In his opinion, this applies primarily to problems of European security and peace.

NATO's military doctrine, he declared, is in a state of crisis. It must be rethought. Instead of relying on concepts based on the existence of two opposed blocs, as in the past, we ought to create a new collective security system.

Speaking of "nuclear guarantees" for Europe on the part of France and other Western countries, the minister noted that France "is not the only country possessing nuclear weapons." "Nuclear guarantees ought to be the subject of special accord. Judging by the present state of affairs, it is perfectly possible to imagine the holding of talks, including talks with the Soviet Union's participation, on the creation of such a collective security system."

Answering a question about the possible withdrawal of French troops from the FRG, J.-P. Chevenement declared: "This must be decided by the Germans themselves. The presence of our troops can be justified only as France's contribution to German security. Tomorrow

they might become a component of a European defense system. But if the Germans request it, we will withdraw the troops."

Moscow Radio To Carry French 'Radio Nostalgie'

LD1403101490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Paris, 12 Mar (TASS)—French music and songs will be heard daily on Moscow radio for five hours beginning from May this year. This was talked about during a press conference which took place today in Paris on the occasion of the signing of an agreement on cooperation between the USSR's Gostleradio in the person of Moscow Radio and the French radio station "Radio Nostalgie."

The agreement envisages the transmission in Moscow during the course of the next 15 years of "Radio Nostalgie" broadcasts, 80 per cent of which will be composed of French music and songs while the remaining 20 per cent will contain information and advertisements from France and the Soviet Union in the Russian and French languages.

Aleksandr Plevako, deputy chairman of the USSR's Gosteleradio, and Herve Berget, general director of "Radio Nostalgie," who spoke during the press conference, talked about prospects and plans for cooperation. The main aim of it is the propagation of French culture and the French language in the Soviet Union. Press conference participants stressed the unique nature of the initiative taken, the implementation of which became possible only in the conditions of perestroyka which is taking place in the Soviet Union, and in the framework of traditional friendly Soviet-French relations.

NOVOYE VREMYA's Editor Departs for Paris

PM1503150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Moscow Departure"]

[Text] CPSU representative V.N. Ignatenko, chief editor of the journal NOVOYE VREMYA, has left Moscow for Paris to attend the French Socialist Party congress, which opens on 15 March.

Soviet-Spanish Economic Commission Meets

LD1503190190 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—The fifth session of the Soviet-Spanish Intergovernment Mixed Commission on Economic and Industrial Cooperation met here today to discuss prospects of commercial and economic relations between the two countries. The Soviet delegation is led by Deputy Foreign Economic Relations Minister Yuriy Chumakov, and the Spanish delegation by Apolonio Ruis Ligero, the state secretary for trade.

Before the session, the Spanish delegation was received by Soviet Minister for Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev. He noted that Soviet-Spanish commercial and economic relations gained momentum recently. After the 1985 and 1986 decline, caused by the reduction of oil and oil products deliveries to Spain, slumping petroleum prices, and smaller purchases of certain Spanish goods, trade between the two countries perked up again in 1989 and finally reached a record level of 814.5 million roubles.

The Spanish delegation showed interest in the further development of relations with the USSR, not only in the traditional areas of cooperation, but also in the development of such new forms as joint ventures.

It was noted, specifically, that there were now 17 registered Soviet-Spanish enterprises, sixteen of which are in the USSR. Production has been started at two ventures—Telur and Intersplav. The possibility of starting fifteen more joint ventures is being considered. These will primarily be joint enterprises for the production of consumer goods, food products and building materials.

Chumakov expressed the hope that the session would help expand Soviet-Spanish relations. He stressed that it was called on the eve of an important event—President Gorbachev's visit to Spain.

Tomorrow the Spanish delegation will have meetings at the state foreign economic commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Bank of Foreign Economic Relations and the light industry committee under the USSR State Planning Committee.

The talks will continue until March 16.

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze Congratulates New Uruguayan Minister

LD1403120190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1005 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, has sent Hector Gross Espiell, minister of foreign affairs of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, a telegram congratulating the latter on the occasion of his assumption of this office, and in which he expresses the hope for the further forward development of the relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Uruguay, for the good of the peoples of both countries.

In a telegram of reply, the minister of foreign affairs of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay made assurances of his firm intention to continue in the future to strengthen the cordial relations existing between our countries, in search of a dialogue that will make the world and international cooperation more fruitful and stable.

Shevardnadze, Venezuela's Planchart Messages Noted

LD1603104490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] In connection with the 45th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Venezuela, the ministers of foreign affairs of the two countries exchanged telegrams of congratulations. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's message stresses that constructive cooperation between the Soviet Union and Venezuela is making a useful contribution to strengthening peace and cooperation among peoples.

Venezuelan Foreign Minister Figueredo Planchart's message points out that at present it is extremely important to expand mutual understanding and dialogue aimed at ensuring peace in the future.

Chilean President Receives Gorbachev Message

LD1503101690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Now we turn to events in another Latin American country, Chile, where the celebrations connected with the end of military rule and the entry into office of a new president have now finished. The La Moneda presidential palace in Santiago has also assumed a businesslike appearance.

[V. Lavrentyev, correspondent, identified by screen caption] The first instructions of the new authorities are already making themselves felt. The number of Carabineros around the palace has been reduced, and there are fewer of them on the streets of Santiago. [video shows exterior of presidential palace and street scenes]

President Patricio Aylwin has already begun to fulfil his election promises. A decree has been signed on the release of political prisoners. The Communist Party has begun the procedure necessary for its legalization. The government is discussing the question of increasing minimum wages. Aylwin is promising to begin with the needy sections of the population and reduce the enormous gap that exists in the country between rich and poor.

At present I can sense in Santiago that the mass of Chileans have a great liking for our country. Taking account of their mood and international realities, Patricio Aylwin, as has already been reported, on the very first day of his presidency, restored Chile's diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

Yesterday the president received the Soviet delegation attending the festivities led by Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, adviser to the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Comrade Zagladin handed Patricio Aylwin a personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. [video shows Zagladin delegation meeting Aylwin]

Ater the meeting, Patricio Aylwin said in an interview with Soviet journalists:

[Begin Aylwin recording in Spanish, with superimposed Russian translation] I have read the letter that President Gorbachev sent me. It is very substantive and expresses ideas, which I share, about the changes taking place in the world and the opportunities opening up for our countries in connection with the restoration of diplomatic relations. I feel that we should facilitate in every way the development of bilateral cooperation in the spheres of the economy, science, and culture. [end recording]

[Announcer] The Soviet delegation led by Comrade Zagladin, adviser to the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which took part in the events connected with the handover of power to the civilian government of President Aylwin, left Santiago today.

New Chilean President Aylwin Interviewed

PM1603105190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Single Edition p 3

[Interview with Chilean President Patricio Aylwin conducted by APN correspondent A. Karmen "For SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA": "Democracy Does Not Exact Revenge"]

[Text] Santiago—[Karmen] A few years ago lawyer Patricio Aylwin decided to abandon his political career and devote himself wholly to purely professional activity, yet today we see that same man as the country's president. What prompted you to change your decision? What feelings have you experienced during these historic days?

[Aylwin] In actual fact it was about five years ago that I came to the conclusion that it was time to end my public and political activity and occupy myself with legal work and writing books. It cannot be excluded that I was induced to take such a decision by a certain disappointment with the failures of the struggle against the dictatorship. But in 1987 a coalition for a "no" vote began to form in opposition to Pinochet's intention of extending his term in office by another eight years. And the idea then arose that I could be a figure that would unite this coalition. After all, many of us participants in the coalition had 16 years earlier been implacable adversaries and occupied different trenches. And I felt that I could again become useful to the cause of uniting antidictatorial forces.

What do I feel now? There is, of course, great satisfaction to be derived from the awareness that I have helped achieve this victory and am today a participant in the process not just of restoring democracy, but also, as we say, bringing about a new coming together of Chilean with Chilean.

[Karmen] Your work as president begins in a very difficult situation: The outgoing regime issued a host of

laws binding your government's hands, the treasury does not have enough funds to meet social needs, and there are many unsolved problems connected with human rights.... How are these bonds to be removed and the people given the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of democracy and social justice? Where will you begin?

[Aylwin] There are tasks which need to be tackled simultaneously. We should first of all democratize our society. We want to start with the municipalities. They should be governed by elected representatives of the people, not appointees. We also want to strengthen all other forms of people's involvement in the country's life. For example, to give greater rights to trade unions in their negotiations with employers and to urban residents' organizations in resolving their district's municipal problems.

We have a host of problems of a social nature. Marked inequality has set in in our country and many Chileans live in extreme poverty. We do not, of course, have the the means to solve all of these problems overnight, but we can certainly make inroads. The state of health care and medical services provided in outlying districts, particularly for the needy, worries us. The education system must be changed, a system for improving workers' skills created, and opportunities opened up for young people to receive vocational and technical training, since our schools prepare young people solely for the university, and it is difficult to get in. Most of them remain jobless.

We will also encounter a shortage of resources and come up against legislative constraints. I am not, by the way, afraid of the latter. I am certain that we will get a big enough majority in parliament to change some laws and to repeal others which really obstruct our path. We will have to pursue a sensible, modest policy of state expenditure and to change the taxation system so that those with larger incomes contribute more to the exchequer.

And alongside this we also have, as is well known, human rights problems.

[Karmen] As we have already broached the question, I would like to know what your approach to the crimes of past years will be and what may lie in store for those who were implicated in them—punishment, a fair examination of the cases, or will the principle of "forgive and forget" be applied?

[Aylwin] "Forget"—in no circumstances! We have repeatedly said that people should know the truth. And we intend to get a clear picture of what happened during those years. This will be done not for the sake of revenge or muckraking. We have no wish to persecute anyone, let alone condemn whole institutions, for example, the armed forces or the forces of order. But it is essential to establish the truth, to shed light on the fate of people who disappeared, to determine the degree of responsibility of the guilty, and to restore justice in order to establish a climate of mutual trust and reconciliation. The time for forgiveness will come one day. But "to forgive" is not the same as "to forget." They are different concepts.

[Karmen] How do you regard General Pinochet's position within the new structures of society? Will his presence as commander in chief of the army not be an obstacle to the restoration of democracy?

[Aylwin] That's a tough question, one we are all asking ourselves. I think that everything depends on how he exercises his functions. If he concentrates on his professional duties, I see no reason for difficulties. I am sure that it will be difficult to induce the Chilean Army to embark on new adventures. If, however, the general takes it into his head to exploit his position for political ends, he will thereby exceed the bounds of his authority as commander in chief. I think that we would then have the opportunity and the means to... how can this best be put?—to rectify the situation.

[Karmen] For 16 and ½ years Soviet people have shown solidarity with the Chilean people's struggle against military dictatorship. Our countries are now restoring relations broken off in September 1973. What can you say on this score?

[Aylwin] Chile is a small country, with a population of just 12 million. The Soviet Union is one of the world's mightiest powers. Bonds of affection and friendship exist between us. And they were manifested in many gestures of help to and solidarity with the democratic forces of Chile from the Soviet Union and its people during the period of dictatorship. We appreciate and value this very highly.

The process of democratization in Chile coincides with reforms taking place in the Soviet Union. And both in your country and in ours the peoples are proceeding along a path of free participation in the building of their own future. And I think that this will help bring us together even more. The restoration of relations between our countries is therefore a very notable and gratifying event.

IZVESTIYA Reports Nicaraguan Amnesty Law

PM1303120590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS roundup: "Nicaragua: Parliament Has Approved Amnesty Law"]

[Text] Managua—By a majority of votes the National Assembly (parliament) of Nicaragua has approved the "Law on a universal amnesty and national conciliation," whose draft was prepared at the initiative of the republic's president, Daniel Ortega.

This law exonerates all Nicaraguans who committed crimes which were in violation of public order and which harmed the country's state security in the period from 19 July 1979 through to the day this amnesty law comes into force. The amnesty is also extended to state employees who committed economic crimes in this period and who have not been legally charged.

The capital's newspaper LA PRENSA, which expresses the views of the leaders of the Opposition National Union which won the general elections in the country, has criticized the new law, warning that its entry into force may mark "the start of a period of anarchy in Nicaragua."

Caracas—"I hope that the United States will keep its word regarding the demobilization and repatriation of the contras," Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega, who is here en route for Chile, said in a talk with journalists. "We are speaking," he pointed out, "of the need for the immediate disarmament and demobilization of the contras so that by 25 April—the day that power is handed over to the new government—they no longer present a threat to Nicaraguans' security and lives. For my part I guarantee the peaceful process of the handing over of power."

Mexico—Mexico has pledged to act as intermediary and to promote the immediate disarmament of Nicaraguan contras formations with a view to ensuring the peaceful handing over of power in Nicaragua. Bayardo Arce, member of the Sandinista National Liberation Front national leadership, informed journalists accredited here of this at the end of his meeting with Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

Washington—Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, Nicaragua's new president elect, has stressed that the country needs "genuine national conciliation." Speaking in the U.S. city of Houston (Texas) to emigres from Nicaragua she pointed out that today Nicaraguans must think primarily of peace. "The attainment of peace in the country is work for everyone since our future and progress consist in just that," Violeta de Chamorro said.

'Enhanced' Vigilance Against Cuban Opposition

PM1203122190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kamorin dispatch: "Incident in the Aldabo District"]

[Text] Havana—An attempt by representatives of a number of groups opposed to the Cuban Government to hold a meeting in Havana encountered resistance from the capital's residents, the newspaper GRANMA reports.

An unsigned article published by the Cuban Communists' organ states that residents of Havana's Aldabo District recently noticed an unusually large number of visitors making for the house of Sebastian Arcos, who was once convicted of trying to leave the country illegally and who is regarded in the district as an "antisocial element."

I will point out that, according to the Western mass media's version, in addition to S. Arcos—deputy chairman of a group calling itself the "Cuban Committee for Human Rights"—the meeting was also attended by several leaders of organizations of a similar orientation, and its purpose was to create a federation of them.

By all accounts, the participants in the meeting had no intention of drawing public attention to themselves. However, as GRANMA emphasizes, many residents of neighboring houses and working people from nearby construction sites and establishments gathered "spontaneously" outside S. Arcos' house. They organized a rally at which they formulated in very vigorous terms their indignation at "the gathering of an overtly counterrevolutionary and anti-Cuban kind" in S. Arcos' house. The leader of the local committee for the defense of the revolution, who spoke next, warned that "counterrevolutionary elements cannot count on impunity as regards their actions."

The "protest action" continued all day, and only late in the evening did the leaders of the party's municipal committee succeed in persuading the rally participants to disperse to their homes. To judge from shots shown on Cuban television, the police were not present at the scene. However, people here recall that not so long ago several leaders of opposition groups were convicted of "systematic dissemination of slanderous fabrications."

The incident in the Aldabo district is one more example of the process of "enhanced revolutionary vigilance," which has begun in the country. Addressing Cuban student youth leaders at the end of last week, Fidel Castro emphasized that anyone who seeks to split the people's monolithic unity is not only an enemy of socialism but also an enemy of the Cuban nation. Let us also recall that, in warning against such attempts, the Cuban leader said at the recent trade union congress: "We ourselves will not have to defeat them: There is no need to fire guns at cockroaches. The people will crush them! Our committees for the defense of the revolution, the workers in our factories, students, young people, old people, and even young pioneers will crush them!"

Arrest of Cuban Rights Activists Detailed

PM1503143790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 8

[Own correspondent A. Kamorin dispatch: "Arrests in Havana"]

[Text] Havana—A GRANMA editorial article reports that eight people—the leadership of a grouping calling itself the Cuban human rights party—have been arrested in the Cuban capital.

The newspaper does not name those who were arrested, describing them as "counterrevolutionary elements." It also indicates that "many of them have served time in jail for criminal activities and have close links with the department representing U.S. interests in Havana." According to Western sources, those arrested include underground human rights movement leaders Samuel Martinez Lara and Tania Diaz Castro. The GRANMA article says that seven of them will have to appear in

court on charges of violating Articles 208 and 209 of the republic's Criminal Code—regarding the organization of illegal alliances, meetings, and demonstrations.

Let us remind our readers that large protest demonstrations were held twice last week in Havana outside rights defenders' houses. Cuban press commentaries indicate that patriotic citizens gathered quite spontaneously in an extremely determined frame of mind, although things did not reach the point where measures of physical persuasion were employed in either case. It must be noted that the climate of intolerance toward everything regarded here as "counterrevolutionary manifestations" increased considerably after Fidel Castro declared those who are endeavoring to split the people's monolithic unity to be "not only enemies of socialism but also enemies of the Cuban nation."

The uncontrolled protest that manifested itself at last week's demonstrations found its logical conclusion in the action taken by the republic's law-enforcement bodies. The fact that the leadership of the Cuban human rights party welcomed the inclusion on the agenda of a session of the corresponding UN commission of an item on the human rights situation on Cuba was the reason for this. IZVESTIYA has already reported that the United States initiated this decision, and it provoked a vehement reaction from the Cuban side.

Oceanographic Survey Conducted With Cuba

LD1902121290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0420 GMT 19 Feb 90

[Text] Havana, 19 Feb (TASS)—TASS correspondent Andrey Borodin reports:

Hydrographic and biological investigations, elaboration of the relief of the sea bed and a detailed description of coastal flora and fauna. Such are the tasks before the participants of a joint Soviet-Cuban oceanological expedition which is now at work in the waters of the Caribbean sea off the southern Cuban littoral. The Soviet research vessel "Vityaz" has become the floating base for both countries' scientists.

The oceanological colleagues are carrying out tasks within the framework of a program to study the living and breeding conditions of lobsters and large marine crabs, industrial hauls of which constitute a main source of freely convertible currency for Cuba.

Formerly these studies were carried out by the Cuban oceanographical vessel "Ulises". Now the republic's scientists have received the opportunity not only to broaden, but also literally to deepen their field of investigations, since there is a small-scale submarine equipped with modern scientific apparatus based on board the "Vityaz", is capable of diving to a depth of 600 meters.

After carrying out the program of tasks off the coast of the special municipality of the Isla de la Juventud, the expedition will carry out number of complex underwater investigations in the region of the well-known Cuban resort of Varadero on the Cuban northern seaboard.

Fugitive Haitian Leader Flies to United States

PM1403143790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 8

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Haiti: Interim President Appointed"]

[Excerpts] For the first time in Haiti's history a woman—Ertha Pascal-Trouillot, member of the Supreme Court—has been appointed interim president of this Caribbean island state. [passage omitted]

According to reports from Port-au-Prince, the situation in Haiti remains tense. [passage omitted]

A U.S. State Department spokesman has confirmed, meanwhile, that the aircraft in which Lieutenant General Prosper Avril and his family left Haiti had landed at a U.S. airbase south of Miami. Gen. Avril had been granted permission to enter the United States on humanitarian grounds and in the hope that his departure from Haiti would promote the normalization of the situation in that country. The State Department possesses no information on the fugitive general's future plans, he explained.

A spokesman for the airbase command later told journalists that Gen. Avril and his family had left the base's territory in a private car, avoiding a meeting with picketing Haitian refugees resident in Miami, who are demanding that the U.S. authorities bring the former president to trial on a charge of repression and human rights violations.

PRAVDA Welcomes 'Glimmer of Hope' in Haiti

PM1303162190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Pavel Bogomolov "Observer's Opinion" under general headline "Haiti: Situation Exacerbates. The Country on the Verge of Anarchy"]

[Text] A paradoxical fact, it would seem: The latest change of power is taking place in the Haitian capital, and the echo of these events can immediately be heard in... the U.S. state of Florida. Thousands of residents in Miami, mostly of Haitian origin, participated in rallies in support of demands to put an end to the legacy of the corrupt military dictatorship in the neighboring Caribbean state, using all the influence of the White House in the interests of bringing a civilian government to power there.

The painful reaction invariably provoked in the United States by the upheavals of political struggle in the Western Hemisphere's poorest country is by no means accidental. The very existence of the "Haitian volcano," which is just a few hundred miles from the United States, is seen by the region's broad public not only as a

consequence of the prolonged internal crisis, which paralyzed Haiti, but also as a serious flaw in Washington's Latin American policy. And indeed, for many decades now the most powerful state in the capitalist world has been demonstrating its clear inability, and sometimes reluctance, to seriously help in the capital reconstruction and renewal of the crumbling edifice of statehood in the neighboring country which is literally next door.

The heirs of the "classic tyrant" Jean-Claude Duvalier, who fled the country 7 February 1986, are skillfully exploiting the fact that the "senior partner" can still not bring itself to support alternative forces in Haiti which are democratic in terms of their social composition and program. Is this not why the entire Haitian history of the last four years is almost a continuous kaleidoscope of successive rulers of the militarist type whose methods of violence against dissidents differed little from those of Duvalier? In fact, with the exception of political scientist Leslie Manigat who held the top state post in Port-au-Prince for just six months, all the other occupants of the presidential palace were invariably generals who were formerly regarded, incidentally, as favorites of the Duvalier family clan.

... And here, it would seem, is the long-awaited glimmer of hope. At least hope that Brigadier General Herard Abraham, who replaced Prosper Avril, will—as he has promised Haitians—limit his rule to 72 hours and then really hand over power to a civilian interim government. It should be acknowledged that the United States—one of the few countries which Haiti's ruling circles still reckon with—has already offered financial aid to the future government. But it is again a question only of aid in holding an election campaign. As if there were not enough instances in Latin American history when, the morning after elections, trampling the electoral voting papers and placards in their hobnailed boots, the military grabbed the helm of state power once again.

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Holds News Conference 15 March

LD1503211190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1852 GMT 15 Mar 90

[News conference held by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 March in the Kremlin—live relay]

[Text] [Unidentified man at the Kremlin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has become [word indistinct]. Responding to numerous requests by journalists who covered the Congress, he has agreed to come to this meeting with you. We have come to an agreement that Mikhail Sergeyevich will deliver a small address and will then answer your questions. But, before we begin work, I would like to congratulate all of you on your participation in the first news conference by the first president of the USSR. [Laughter] You have the floor. [further laughter, slight applause]

[Gorbachev] Good evening! Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, dear comrades: We are back from the Congress. You know that we have not kept our promise, as has already happened more than once, but again this is for objective reasons. I hope that you will show understanding about this, but, nevertheless, I must mention this, respecting and setting store by the good relations and cooperation that have been established between us.

The Third Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was convened for resolving important, I would say, cardinal, questions for our country, for the policy of perestroyka, has ended.

The logic itself of the restructuring processes has led us to make these decisions connected with serious changes—perhaps even radical changes—in the highest echelons of power, with the introduction of the institution of the presidency in our country for the first time in history. To speak briefly, in order to explain precisely what the reasons are that have led us to make these decisions, decisions which a year and even a few months back we did not think of, and, what is more, even thought of as being inexpedient under our conditions.

Events within the framework of perestroyka have now gathered a great deal of mometum in our country. Processes are proceeding quickly, and in a contridictory way. In months we have been covering a huge distance, a distance which in conditions of evolution it would have taken us perhaps ten years to cover. And for this reason what a year ago, and even a few months ago, was correct, today in the new conditions is already insufficient and new decisions are required. It is namely the processes of democraticization that have embraced all areas of life in our society—the economy, the political process, the social sphere, and the cultural sphere—the processes of decentralization which are characteristic of our society, present society, and finally the stormy processes which have developed within the framework of the transformation of the Soviet federation—all this has aroused powerful forces, I would say of a centrifugal nature. We felt that counterbalances were necessary; mechanisms were necessary that would balance these processes so that our ship would not be shaken. The signs of this are evident. Anyone here in Moscow, in the Soviet Union, I think, can confirm the truth of this conclusion. That's the first thing.

Secondly, the acuteness of the present situation, with the necessity of speeding up perestroyka and the urgency, the urgency, of solving many problems, have also dictated the necessity of improving our executive mechanism.

We have discovered that many important laws we have passed and from which we had expected deep changes are being implemented too slowly. We are dissatisfied about this. It is something we cannot reconcile ourselves with for long. Alarm is being felt in society because of this. We have departed, emerged from one system, the command and administrative system, but the new methods we are counting on under democracy—radical economic reform, political reform—have not even begun to be effective. And society now finds itself in this stage of transition, and is being subjected to severe trials. There is a threat of destabilization. And we must therefore reduce and compress this transitional period as far as possible so as to switch on the new mechanisms as quickly as we can, both in the economy and in the political sphere, and generally in all spheres of our society. So the real situation, not only strategically, as it were [Gorbachev changes thought]—our calculations and plans have demanded precisely these radical solutions, but the real situation has also pushed us in that same direction. Accordingly, we have decided to make the decisions with which you are familiar; in other words, they are vitally necessary to us. I do not want either to exaggerate or underestimate their significance. I believe we have made the decisions we need to make today. I think I'll confine myself to these remarks, so as to leave more time for you.

[Unidentified journalist] Mikhail Sergeyevich, first of all I would like to add my modest voice to all those congratulations flowing in your direction in connection with your election as the first president of the USSR. My question is: I understand that the international sphere is a sphere of delicate decisions and statements. But how do you see, or perhaps how do you perceive, your first presidential international initiative?

[Gorbachev] I have already tried to outline that in my speech today. I think I will use my new powers to make the initiatives that we have begun more dynamic. It is not a question, in my view, of surprising the world with yet another initiative. But it is a question of attaching fresh dynamism to the major initiatives we have put forward. I have already said that, and I hope my current powers are now also enabling me to conduct affairs in this sphere of politics with greater effectiveness and great dynamism.

[Unidentified moderator addressing someone in the audience] Over to you.

[Krivomazov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I am Nikolay Krivomazov from PRAVDA. We are merciless people keeping you from work. It will soon be midnight. Therefore, one of the questions I have is serious and the other is not so serious. How long do you think it will take for the system of presidential power to come into being?

[Gorbachev] I think the adoption of the decision to introduce presidential power in the country is a matter of a radical nature. And what is needed for it is not just to elect a president but also, you are right, to create a whole system, that is, to renew the system of executive power. Although we have thought out a great deal, there are probably things we have failed to envisage. I think that on the one hand we must act without delay. Otherwise, we would not have had to hold an emergency congress. We could have arrived at that in the framework of our work on the new Constitution and made a decision when the time came to adopt it. And after adopting it we would have had to introduce the institution of the presidency on the basis of the new constitution. But life has made its demand. Therefore, on the one hand, we will be acting so that the president [Gorbachev changes thought]—incidentally, he has already been given the first instructions at the congress now in connection with the situation in Lithuania. So there will not be any rest for the president. Nor will he have any special time to think things over or shape them up. It will be necessary to act immediately and create the presidential power system.

[Dolgonov] Vyacheslav Dolgonov, group of IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents. To begin with, first of all, IZVESTIYA congratulates you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, on your election and our question is this: We have written about this more than once, and we encounter every day in parliament the struggle of certain groups of opinions, and, at times, organized struggle against the adoption of decisions by parliament. And further, it is often the case that these decisions, in our opinion, by virtue of the fact that they lose through this petty resistance, they lose their driving force in some way and are carried out more slowly and somehow more poorly. In your opinion, to what extent can presidential authority help improve such a situation?

[Gorbachev] I hope, and am convinced, that when we are able to develop the potential of the institution of the presidency, we will be able to act more energetically and put at the disposal of the country and the people a more effective executive institution. This will give us the possibility of overcoming the amorphousness of power, its vagueness, and I think those who participated in solving this problem proceeded from this very point. I see further possibilities here. We will not consider this the panacea for everything. That would not be serious. I think it is precisely in the combination of an active, gathering pace—I would say a good pace of work and the competence of the Supreme Soviet, in combination with the new bodies of Soviet power formed on the basis of the elections held in the republics and locally, in combination with the fact that regroupings of forces are taking place in the government—that we will be capable, nevertheless, of conducting matters more effectively, in a businesslike manner. But I think that, first of all I expect, we need to overcome the irresponsibility that was born of references to collegiality and demands that every question be decided by a collegium. I think that introduction of the institution of president now brings a great deal of clarity to the matter. And I think the enhancement of responsibility, I think that is the most important consequence we are counting on, and which we are convinced will take place as a result of how that institution of executive power will function.

[Unidentified reporter] Mikhail Sergeyevich, accept congratulations from the Vremya program, too. We know that you, as the head of state, are now faced with a great many problems, important and acute ones. Nevertheless, there are probably one or two that are the most urgent, the most paramount, to which the president of the Soviet Union will devote the greatest attention. What are these, please?

[Gorbachev] I would say that there is actually more than one problem. We need to radicalize the economic reform. We need to urgently tackle renewal of the union treaty and the federation and we need to take the most resolute measures to strengthen people's security, the defense of their rights and freedoms. And in general, we must defend perestroyka and democracy.
[Journalist] Thank you.
[Unidentified man] Don't mention it.
[GUARDIAN reporter] THE GUARDIAN, a British newspaper. Mr President, Comrade President, I do not know which is the correct form of address.

[Gorbachev] I welcome that. [laughter in hall]

[GUARDIAN reporter] You are still the general secretary of the CPSU. However, recently, you have renounced a whole series of positions that earlier were considered to be part of the theory and practice of the Communist Party, such as, for instance, the dictatorship of the proletariat, a one-party system, the ban on factions within the party. Can you explain to us which specific points of your political philosophy and present concept of democracy distinguish you from social democrats, or do you consider yourself to be already more of a social democrat than a communist? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I not only consider myself to be a member of the Communist Party, but also a Communist. And that does not detract from my respect, and does not lessen my respect for representatives of other socialist trends, or for the search for such trends.

Moreover, there is the realization that we are one civilization, that we are living within the framework of an interrelated world and that each people, while realizing its choice, at the same time also takes advantage of the achievements of civilization. I suppose that we, too,

having decided to impart through perestroyka new dynamism to open up the potential of socialism, will at the same time also take advantage of experience, but as it applies to our conditions. Most importantly, we must avoid what has inflicted great damage in the realization of the socialist idea, when we foisted one model on others or tried to copy a model. In one case we foisted a model on others and in one case simply those who followed and copied as they went along... But in this connection they allowed deformations to occur, which cost them dearly and which to a certain extent inflicted damage on the socialist idea itself.

But what is amazing, even after having gone through all this and having experienced all the blows of destiny, is that our people have remained faithful to the socialist idea. All this remains alive in it. And it is on this basis that, interpreting the entire past experience, taking advantage of the achievements both of world civilization and the socialist movement in the world, we have enriched our socialist politics, what we have called perestroyka, and have realized this, for the sake of which we made a choice in 1917. We will not copy foreign experience; we are not foisting our perestroyka on anyone. From the very first days when we embarked on this path I have been repeating that we need perestroyka; our society has suffered to bring it into being. We are not foisting our choice on any one. If any one is interested, please study our experience. If it is useful, please use it. It is in this way that we will act also vis-a-vis other movements.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, All-Union Radio, Mayak, Igor Zorin. You know industry and agriculture well. What will be your first steps to improve our economy, whose wheels, to put it mildly, are spinning round without going anywhere.

[Gorbachev] The first steps will include measures connected with the radicalization of the economy, of the economic reform. I am profoundly convinced that answers to problems, answers to problems that are now besieging you and me, and, most importantly, from which the people suffer, what determines the situation on the market must be sought by us not only on the basis of a return to the command-and-administrative system, but on the basis of acceleration, of switching on new mechanisms. I see and feel that the first steps will be precisely in this direction. If any specific points were to be singled out, they would concern two things, first and foremost: first, the normalization of the situation on the market; this is a plan of action that cannot be delayed, so to speak. As far as the plan for the future is concerned, this involves everything that taps and provides us with new opportunities—the laws on ownership, land, leaseholding, and so on. In other words, along the path of denationalization, on the basis of a new attitude or approach to ownership, we must tap opportunities for displaying initiative and enterprise. These are the things, the economic freedom, which should, in the end, allow us to achieve the desired result.

[Unidentified speaker] Would the representatives of broadcasting and the press move more quickly to the microphone. Go ahead please. I give the floor to the young man [words indistinct]

[Ivanov] RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA congratulates you on your election. I am Ivanov. Mikhail Sergeyevich, tell us, please, about the extent to which you intend to rely on the workers' movement in your activities. Are you satisfied with the information that reaches you from working-class regions?

[Gorbachev] I will answer the first part of your question in the following way. No doubt you noticed that when I addressed myself to the Soviet people at the conclusion of this evening, my first appeal for support was to the working class. I am confident that it is precisely this social force that is firmly committed to the socialist ideal and restructuring. Its views, attitude, and position will determine the success of this entire business. Therefore, I attach immense importance to the workers' movement and its role in restructuring.

As far as information is concerned, I receive it via various channels. But, above all, I prefer personal contacts. I also thank RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. In my view, it is moulding its image. Its working-class character is making itself felt, so to speak, and this is good.

[EL PAIS Reporter] From the Spanish daily EL PAIS. During the last few days we have learned that the Defense Council has disappeared, and that its powers are being transferred to the Presidential Council. I would like to know what the decision to dissolve the Defense Council was based on, and in what way the council had been unsatisfactory.

And one more question. Your powers now include issuing decrees. I would like to find out whether you already have a list of issues on which you intend to issue decrees—for instance, more radical economic measures than those of the government.

[Gorbachev] Concerning the first part of your question, I would like to make the following explanations. I think that in principle the matter is not changing all that much. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet used to head the Defense Council. Today the issues of leadership of the Armed Forces and issues of security and defense are included in the president's powers. And I also think that a significant number of the figures who were connected with the work of the Defense Council will continue to participate and offer their assistance to the president in solving these questions. Therefore, we have complete continuity here.

As far as part two of your question is concerned, I would say the following. First of all, we must make sure that the mechanism for implementing the government-proposed program is made more effective. But you have phrased your question very subtly, and I should say that I feel—and that's how it presumably will be, especially as we have already had such an exchange of views with the

leader of our government, Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov—that we will probably have to bring forward and speed up the resolution of many problems which, according to the government progarm, were scheduled for a later date. But here you will just have to wait a little, and then you will see this in reality.

[Sultanov] Sultanov, Uzbek Television and Radio. Esteemed Comrade President, in a few days' time, on 21 March, the Nou Ruz [New Year] festival will be widely celebrated in Muslim countries abroad, and also in our Central Asian republics. This is the festival of spring and the first day of the New Year. What would the first president of the Soviet Union like to say to the peoples of the Soviet and foreign East on his first working day?

[Gorbachev] First of all, I would like to speak words of deep respect to the peoples of the East. I know that the region, which covers many countries, has many problems but also a common destiny. I think that means, above all, the desire for peace, because it is, after all, a restless region and I am sure that there is also the desire for a better life there. I would like to express the hope that these expectations and hopes of the peoples of the East will be realized.

[Unidentified Reporter] [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] I did not understand that.

[Sultanov] There are also the peoples of the Soviet East, of our republics.

[Gorbachev] Certainly. I said this includes our own country. There is also a vast world within our country. Vast though our country is, that is also a vast world. And I would like to greet them, and what is happening in our country today will, I think, also have a fruitful effect on the transformations in the republics of Central Asia. I think the need is now being felt there for great changes, great transformations.

[Sultanov] Thank you.

[PRIZYV Reporter] I represent [words indistinct] the editorial office of the newspaper PRIZYV. Mikhail Sergeyevich, in accordance with the law, you relinquished your powers as a deputy when you became president. At the same time, during the congress itself two deputies representing thousands of voters announced their resignations. Do you not feel that these facts are evidence of the emergence of a trend, and what is your attitude to it?

[Gorbachev] I do not think they are. There are...[changes thought] I spoke with one of them, and I do not think that process has become, as it were, irreversible. You know, we are working—and as far as the Supreme Soviet is concerned in particular, and this applies precisely to the deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet—the situation has changed; the position of those people has changed; they have worked for a while under new conditions; they have a new way of life; and they are comparing and seeing whether it is acceptable to them or not.

In any case, some feel that perhaps they—and this testifies to their morality—cannot do everything that they promised. In general, I think this is a normal process. I can see no drama here and foresee no stream...no mass withdrawal, so to speak, from the body of deputies.

[Deputy Korotkov] Korotkov. Mikhail Sergeyevich, accept our congratulations. Would you tell us, please, who is going to substitute for you during your leave?

[Gorbachev] I think the situation will look like this: Wherever the president is, including when he is on leave, he will continue to perform his leadership role. This means, though, that members of the Presidential Council will be charged with some specific current affairs. But I think that no question of principle, no crucial question will be solved without the president.

[(Taknukhyon)], in Korean with simultaneous translation into Russian] (Taknukhyon) MBC Television Company of South Korea. Esteemed Mr. President, now that you have been elected president of the Soviet Union, how do you assess the prospects for establishing diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea?

[Gorbachev] I assess them as good.

[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS Reporter] The paper MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS. We welcome and congratulate the first president of the country. Now here is a question. Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is already clear by now that the Supreme Soviet is obviously late with the adoption of the law on republics withdrawing from the USSR. The situation is complex and might it not be the case that the law that will probably be adopted soon will be of a punitive nature? And what is to be done to avoid this? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Well, first of all, we have many arguments about delays, indecision, half-measures, and so on. We must be very careful. I would wish our Soviet press—as for the foreign press, it's none of their business, so to speak—but to you I can express a wish, as president, because speaking today I said that there are very many arguments about our being late with this and that law, on ownership, land, and other subjects concerning radical economic reform. You know, this is both true and not true. Yes, it would have been better earlier. But you should have tried to do it earlier when even today we still feel that we lack knowledge, experience, and competence. We are gaining some experience in life. We have tried contracts, financial autonomy, self-management, democracy in electing directors, and so on and so on. And we are still trying and trying.

And indeed these are all new forms, and in order to embody this in law, to establish the legal basis, you must, after all, serve a long and hard apprenticeship. And probably no one wants to serve a long and hard apprenticeship, but you can't not do it in high-level politics, in this kind of turn, and we are making a historic turn,

laying down foundations that will altogether change the nature of our society. That is why—well, I can forgive young people and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS; it's a good thing when they urge the older men on. But as far as others are concerned, I wouldn't get too carried away with, let's say, catchy terminology, although for the press things may be hard without this; it might not even get read, it needs such headlines; it's unimportant what's in the text but the headline is important. Right? (?And as far as everything goes) everyone has to do some very serious thinking on how to present what we are doing, because we are doing an enormous, historic, global thing, something that will determine the future both of our country and of the socialist idea and, considering the real weight of the country, this is going to determine and affect the world. That is why we must be equally bold and decisive, but also considered and careful. After all, there are 300 million people in our country alone.

[(Bajanski)] (Bajanski), the paper POLITIKA, Yugoslavia. First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your election as president.

[Gorbachev] Thank you, Comrade (Bajanski).

[(Bajanski)] Your policy of new thinking has, for five years now, been keeping up a good pace in important initiatives for very positive effects in the world. Today you voiced one radical idea, for the system of blocs to be replaced with a joint organization for security. Through what specific steps are you counting on success for such a radical idea?

[Gorbachev] Life is urging us on, as well as as our thoughts, our search, and our policies. In particular, the issue of the unification of Germany is the kind of case where we must do some vigorous thinking so that as a result of this action, which the Germans are naturally taking, there is no distortion, no upset balance. That is why now, in principle, we should already be not only thinking but also moving all our actions on this account into the practical domain. And I think that, first and foremost, we should proceed along the road of filling the presently-existing blocs with new content, create new structures apart from the existing military alliances—that is, change the nature of the former and promote the creation of the latter, and thereby a whole system would be elaborated, on the basis of which a new edifice of security in Europe could be formed.

I include—I think that going through the Vienna process, through Helsinki, and undertaking new steps on unifying, on setting up economic, trade-economic, scientific and technical links, we will go towards that Europe and that security that will be firmly based. Maybe I am speaking, how shall I put it, disjointedly, but I imagine that it is namely in this direction that we will go, in this way.

[Unidentified moderator] Please.

[Zailyev] Zailyev, Azerbaijani Television. We congratulate you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, on your election as president.

[Gorbachev] Thank you.

[Zailyev] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have two questions. First, in connection with the introduction of the institution of the presidency, will presidential rule be introduced in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast? And second, do you have the right to dissolve the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the union republics?

[Gorbachev] I think that we—concerning Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and, in general, the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia, as a result of the many sessions, closed sessions and open conversations, which were, moreover, deferential, frank, and in the final stages constructive—we came to a decision that opens up a new stage. I think it is necessary to think about this, and not about anything else.

And finally, the second question. I think that the ammendments we introduced have already been published. There the rights of the president regarding dissolution of the Supreme Soviet are strictly stipulated, strictly stipulated. It is in the event of some situation arising between the chambers, when it disrupts the normal work and nothing is being achieved—then the president can put the question to the Congress of People's Deputies. But he himself cannot. It will probably be when we enter a new stage of presidential authority that it will develop. Concerning the dissolution of the supreme soviets and so on, I think this must be ruled out. And, in general, the president gave an oath today that he must strictly follow the Constitution, especially considering that we are coming to, we must come to, a new union agreement, the Constitution must envisage a clear demarcation of union and republican competency. Where the responsibility is that of the union, it must show the union's priority. Where the responsibility is republican, it must show the republican priority, and not otherwise. And it must be strictly observed by all.

[(Batalova)]: (Batalova), speaking from MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. I would like to ask a question on behalf of both MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and VECHERNAYA MOSKVA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you spent your youth in Moscow. You studied in Moscow, at the university in Ulitsa Gertsena, graduated from the law institute, the law faculty. Moscow became a part of your life and here you were elected president. Well, there are a great many problems in Moscow and now we acutely feel the important problem arising from the fact that Moscow lacks status as a capital city. How do you see the need for the adoption of this law making Moscow the capital of the Soviet Union? What developments does this have, in your view, for the future of Moscow and the country? And would you not like one of the first laws that you sign as the first president of the country to be precisely this law?

[Gorbachev] Well, first, thank you for reminding me of the years of my youth. This is always pleasant. It was a long time ago. I feel that I am a Muscovite. A lot has happened here—in my personal and sociopolitical life—and I feel that I am a Muscovite, I love Moscow and feel for Muscovites and for this city. It is not a simplecity. If we consider that there are 9 million people in Moscow itself, 6 million or 7 million in Moscow Oblast, and 2.5 to 3 million people passing through every day, then a huge world, a complex world results. And for this reason, I believe that Moscow also needs the country's president to demonstrate personal concern and attention to the development of Moscow. Yes, this problem about which you spoke is currently being discussed—the status of the capital. And I think that when the discussion of this problem comes to an end, I will then be able to give you an answer. This will be either a law or a decision. In any case, Moscow needs to have sensible plans for its present and future; I think these are very topical issues.

[(Batalova)] So once the law has been adopted we can count on an interview with you.

[Gorbachev] Yes.

[Stepovoy] From the parliamentary department of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, Anatoliy Stepovoy. In our newspaper there are a great many questions for you, Comrade President. One of these questions is how often will you be within the walls of this hall? Will we miss you? The question goes along these lines. What do you think? How will you build your relations with the Supreme Soviet, and what will be your relations with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet? And, of course, how often will you be at the sessions, and will you be at the sessions at all? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] First of all, I thought that you were asking me about meetings with the press. I hope that they will be regular. I promise that, to both Soviet and foreign journalists. I consider that my duty. However, that is further complicated by a shortage. We have many shortages, and one is a shortage of time. And as for relations and interrelations, I think that interactions between the executive power—and in particular the highest official, which the president of the country is—with the supreme legislative body will be normal and regular, but nevertheless I will concentrate more on the work of the Presidential Council and also the Council of the Federation. My role will therefore in this sense, of course, change somewhat. But today, we elected a new chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and I hope that the Supreme Soviet will progress; we are awaiting very important decisions from it.

[Stepovoy] Thank you.

[Terekhov] Soviet radio, Terekhov, and our publication INTERFAX. We congratulate you on your election as first president. The first president is a great and important milestone in the history of the Soviet country—and it is probably no small milestone in your history as an individual, in your life. Tell me, please—what qualities will remain with you as president, from the time you were chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and—pardon me—what qualities would you not like to take with you to the presidency?

[Gorbachev] in the first place, I will remain myself. Many wishes are being expressed in different forms. You have heard how much has been said, and in what form, to me, when I was a candidate for this post.

Nevertheless I have, it seems to me, one characteristic—that is to be myself.

That is how I will remain.

[Unidentified moderator] Go ahead, please.

[Unidentified journalist] I am from the Japanese news agency KYODO TSUSHIN. As a representative of the Japanese press, I would like to congratulate you on your election. I have two questions. A decision on the Lithuanian problem was adopted today at the Congress. I have the following question about this: Would you tell me, please, what you think of the idea that the only way to resolve this problem is some kind of political dialogue or negotiations with Lithuania. And my other question: tell me, please, precisely when you decided that a presidency had to be established. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Well, first of all, we considered it necessary to express at the Third Congress of People's Deputies the attitude of the Congress in connection with the events that have taken place in Lithuania and the decisions that have been taken by the supreme organs of power in that republic.

We considered that both the Lithuanian people and the country expected that of us.

Since what we are discussing are the realities that have emerged within the framework of the postwar process and development, this concerns all of us who are living here in Europe.

And therefore we had to express our assessment and our atttitude.

But as a result of the discusion, I should say that the Congress, on the one hand, showed firmness and principle in expressing, in assessing, the decision which had been taken as illegitimate—while at the same time instructing and confirming the right of each people to self-determination; but before the law on secession had been passed, the decisions taken in the Lithuanian Republic had ceased to be in force.

At the same time, the Congress instructed the president to safeguard the legitmate rights of all people living in that republic, and to defend the interests of the USSR.

In addition, we—indeed I—said that we would not negotiate, but would conduct a dialogue—a respectful dialogue—with the people of Lithuania, with its representatives, with its bodies, regarding future relations.

And I think that this will take time.

Both the Lithuanian people and the union have an interest in finding solutions that, well, will above all preserve our union, while ensuring differentiated approaches on the basis of a new union treaty: differentiated federal links in the Federation itself.

If the question is eventually decided on the basis of a referendum, in such a way that the peoples residing in Lithuania decide to secede from the Soviet Union, then it must be a process that will include an examination of the whole range of issues—as a result of which clarity will emerge, and the interests of both Lithuania and of the Soviet Union will be realized.

[Unidentified journalist] I represent the Egyptian journal AL-THAWRAH. Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is an honor for me, as an Arab and an Egyptian, to congratulate you on your new post.

[Gorbachev] Thank you.

[Unidentified journalist] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the entire Arab world is looking precisely to you with regards to settling the problem of emigres to the occupied Arab lands—because there have been many other statements. What solution do you see to this problem, bearing in mind your legislation, of course? Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] Yes, on the one hand we have harmonized our legislation on these questions with international law. This has changed the situation. First and foremost, I would not like the Arab world to suspect us of having any designs beyond this approach to this question, which is based on values common to all mankind and on international law. This is the first thing.

Second, I think that this process may now be more dynamic than was the case previously. In any case, however, we expect that in the very near future all this will proceed more calmly. Finally, we are not abandoning our policy of consultation and the exchange of views on these questions. I think that this is a matter of general concern to us. Together we must correctly evaluate this problem on the basis of mutual understanding and in a spirit of cooperation, and, we must act in accordance with this evaluation.

[Unidentified speaker] [words indistinct]

[Kosyrev] I am Kosyrev, from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you are now not only the country's first president, but the first supreme commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces. At the present time, many people are talking about military reform. You have also spoken about it. What do you understand by this concept of military reform? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] We have a new military doctrine. The implementation of this militar·y doctrine requires a new structure—restructuring —of the Armed Forces. Disarmament processes are under way. This also makes restructuring of the Armed Forces necessary. All this must take into account that military reform must take place within the context of the real situation currently prevailing, both in this country and, in the world. But one thing is clear. As always, we take the Armed Forces seriously—and I said this yet again today. We will display constant concern for the Armed Forces, for the officers and for the soldiers. Problems have accumulated in this area. We will do this. I think that as a result of the defense reform we must have a modern Army, with at least two very essential features—it must be professionally trained, and it must have at its disposal advanced, effective weapons.

[Unidentified speaker] [words indistinct]

[Unidentified journalist] From the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO. Mikhail Sergeyevich, could you perhaps tell us what the content of these major decisions will be,—the ones you talked about in your program statement during your visit to the United States of America?

[Gorbachev] Yes, a large package of problems presents itself there. Above all, nevertheless, this is...[changes thought] We hope that by that time we will have reached a good deal of agreement with regard to a 50 percent reduction in strategic armaments. This process has been revitalized. Great efforts are being made here on both sides, and we hope that by that time we will have an opportunity to, so to speak, already sketch the outline of a new treaty, on the basis of which it will then be possible to work on drawing up the treaty itself. I think that this is a large subject. I think we will also have the opportunity to compare notes on matters that have developed in Europe, looking at matters, within the framework of the European process; and here, it seems to me, there is a large area for cooperation.

We have always viewed the European process as one in which both the United States and Canada should necessarily take part. There must be no suspicions about that. And I think that U.S. participation in this process is an important factor, beyond all suspicions and creating prerequisites for seeking a real balance. That is why I think this will become the subject of a serious exchange-...because there is a summit meeting in Europe ahead, Helsinki 2, and the dynamics of the European process will require regular consultations, talks and exchanges. Incidentally this is the way it is happening now: meetings, talks, telephone conversations, and exchanges of letters are under way. Everything now has speeded up, speeded up, speeded up....

Next I think will come a review, comparison and an exchange of views on what concerns...not only an exchange of views but also a considerable advance where chemical weapons are concerned. Here we are making considerable joint efforts from both sides. I think that this will become a subject....

And through enumeration I think there will also be the question of stopping nuclear tests, at least in relation to the treaties that were...to the draft treaties that were

(?signed) in 1974-76, and to the continuation of the exchange of views on this most important problem. I also think we are approaching the point when we will need a serious conversation concerning broadening cooperation in the economic field, and, in fact, preparatory exchanges, preparatory work in this respect is under way.

I don't think we will fail to discuss regional problems. This remains, as always, in the purview of meetings of the Soviet and U.S. sides. And in general I think these will be major talks.

[Unidentified moderator] Dear colleagues, Mikhail Sergeyevich promised to convene with us regularly. I think it is better for us not to overtax his goodwill. Let us limit ourselves to two last questions, the more so since our time is running out.

[(Kazhakhmetova)] from MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, in many countries of the world presidents are heads of governmental commissions to combat AIDS. Bearing in mind that this disaster is unavoidably looming large over our country and, in fact, we have no time to think, are you as president thinking of becoming head of such a governmental commission?

[Gorbachev] I am not thinking of becoming head of such a commission, quite frankly, but that this problem requires my attention, I am sure.

[Unidentified moderator] And a last question please.

[(?Goribov)] Commentator (?Goribov) from USSR Gosteleradio Central Broadcasting for Foreign Countries. Respected Comrade President: In your speech you expressed satisfaction with the development of relations with the People's Republic of China, and confirmed our country's adherence to the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives. What in your view needs to be done in order to augment the positive capital or potential that has been accumulated in the Far East—in particular with our interrelations with that other very major republic, that very major country, the People's Republic of China? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Preparations are already under way now for the visit of the prime minister of the PRC to our country. I think that this will be a major event; it will impart new dynamics to interrelations which are already now, following my visit to the People's Republic of China, taking shape between us. We value these relations very highly, we set store by them, and will do everything to encourage them to progress. We have great opportunities—and I think many problems will be within the field of vision of the forthcoming visit, both as concerns our bilateral relations and as concerns the situation in the Pacific Ocean and the Asiatic region. I am convinced that our relations with China will be stable and will progress. Thank you.

[Unidentified moderator] Allow me to thank, on your behalf, Mikhail Sergeyevich, the president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. [applause is heard; the news conference ends]

Presidential Powers Bill Survives Postponement

LD1403154990 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 14 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—The extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR this afternoon adopted, after two days of hot debates, a bill amending the present Soviet Constitution. The document establishes the post of president, specifies his powers and amends articles of the Constitution legalising the Communist Party as the country's only party.

Whereas there were no particular debates over the articles stipulating the party's role and establishing the presidency, a heated controversy arose concerning the president's would-be powers. There were two approaches: Some deputies advocated broad presidential powers, while others strove to restrict them and to make the president dependent on the parliament.

At noon the Congress survived a truly dramatic moment: The advocates of curtailed presidential powers, realising they were about to lose, tabled a draft decision pronouncing the voting null and void and postpning the adoption of the bill to the next Congress. This would signify the collapse of everything achieved at the current Congress. But the draft was rejected by a majority vote. Only 409 deputies supported it, 1,398 voted against and 163 abstained.

The document adopted today gives the president decidedly broad powers but also creates an effective counterbalance to any abuse of power.

The Congress decided by an absolute majority vote to elect the first president of the USSR by secret ballot at the current Congress.

After a brief interval, the deputies will nominate candidates to the post of head of state.

Text of Law on Presidency

PM1503192090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Morning Edition pp 1-3

["USSR Law on Instituting the Post of President of the USSR and Making Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law)"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] With a view to ensuring the further development of the profound political and economic transformations being implemented in the country, strengthening the constitutional system and citizens' rights, freedoms, and security, and improving coordination among the USSR's

supreme organs of state power and management, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolves:

I. To institute the post of president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is stipulated that the institution of the post of president of the USSR does not change the legal position or entail any restriction on the competence of the union and autonomous republics enshrined in the Constitutions of the union and autonomous republics and the USSR Constitution.

II. The following amendments and additions are to be made to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law):

1. The words "the leading role of the Communist Party—the vanguard of all the people—grew" are to be deleted from the preamble.

2. Articles 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 51 are to read:

"Article 6. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other political parties, as well as trade union, youth, and other social organizations and mass movements, participate in the formulation of the policy of the Soviet state and in the administration of state and social affairs through their representatives elected to the soviets of people's deputies and in other ways.

"Article 7. All political parties, social organizations, and mass movements, in the exercise of the functions stipulated in their programs and statutes, operate within the framework of the Constitution and Soviet laws.

"The formation and operation of parties, organizations, and movements having the aim of forcibly changing the Soviet constitutional system and the integrity of the socialist state, undermining its security, or kindling social, national, or religious strife are not permitted";

"Article 10. The economic system of the USSR develops on the basis of ownership by Soviet citizens and collective and state ownership.

"The state creates the conditions necessary for the development of diverse forms of ownership and ensures equal protection for them.

"The land, its mineral resources, water resources, and the plant and animal world in their natural state are the inalienable property of the peoples inhabiting a given territory, are under the jurisdiction of the soviets of people's deputies, and are granted to citizens, enterprises, institutions, and organizations for their utilization.

"Article 11. A USSR citizen's property is his personal property and is used to meet material and spiritual needs and carry out autonomous economic activity and other activity that is not banned by law.

"Any property for consumption and production purposes acquired out of earned income and on other lawful grounds may be under the ownership of a citizen, with the exception of those forms of property whose acquisition by citizens for their own ownership is not permitted.

"In order to pursue peasant and personal subsidiary farming and for other purposes stipulated by law, citizens are entitled to hold land plots in heritable life tenure, and also in use [polzovaniye].

"The right of inheritance of a citizen's property is acknowledged and protected by law.

"Article 12. Collective property is the property of leaseholding enterprises, collective enterprises, cooperatives, joint-stock companies, economic organizations, and other associations. Collective property is created through the transformation, by methods stipulated by law, of state property and through the voluntary amalgamation of the property of citizens and organizations.

"Article 13. State property is unionwide property, the property of union republics, and the property of autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, krays, oblasts, and other administrative-territorial units (communal property)."

"Article 51. USSR citizens have the right to form political parties and social organizations and to participate in mass movements that promote the development of political activeness and independent activity and the satisfaction of their diverse interests.

"Social organizations are guaranteed the conditions for the successful fulfillment of their statutory tasks."

3. A new Chapter 15(1) is to be added to the USSR Constitution, reading as follows:

"Chapter 15(1). The President of the USSR.

"Article 127. The head of the Soviet state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—is the president of the USSR.

"Article 127(1). Any citizen of the USSR no younger than 35 and no older than 65 years can be elected president of the USSR. The same person can be president of the USSR for no more than two terms.

"The president of the USSR is elected by USSR citizens on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage by secret ballot for a 5-year term. The number of candidates for the post of president of the USSR is not limited. Elections for the president of the USSR are considered valid if at least 50 percent of voters participated in them.

"The candidate who has received over half the votes of voters taking part in the election in the USSR as a whole and in the majority of union republics is deemed to be elected.

"The procedure for elections of the president of the USSR is defined by USSR law.

"The president of the USSR cannot be a people's deputy.

"The person who is president of the USSR can receive wages for that post alone.

"Article 127(2). Upon inauguration the president of the USSR swears an oath at a sitting of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

"Article 127(3). The president of the USSR:

"1) is the guarantor of observance of Soviet citizens' rights and freedoms and of the USSR Constitution and laws;

"2) takes the necessary measures to protect the sovereignty of the USSR and union republics and the country's security and territorial integrity and to implement the principles of the national-state structure of the USSR;

"3) represents the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics inside the country and in international relations;

"4) ensures coordination among the USSR's supreme organs of state power and management;

"5) submits to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies annual reports on the state of the country; briefs the USSR Supreme Soviet on the most important questions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy;

"6) submits to the USSR Supreme Soviet candidates for the posts of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, USSR prosecutor general, and USSR chief state arbiter, and then submits these officials to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies for confirmation; makes representations to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies regarding releasing the aforementioned officials, with the exception of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, from their duties;

"7) places before the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of the resignation or of accepting the resignation of the USSR Council of Ministers; in coordination with the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers releases from their post and appoints members of the USSR Government, subsequently submitting them for confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet;

"8) signs USSR laws; is entitled within a period of no more than two weeks to refer a law along with his objections back to the USSR Supreme Soviet for repeat discussion and voting. If the USSR Supreme Soviet confirms its earlier decision by a two-thirds majority in each chamber, the president of the USSR signs the law;

"9) has the right to suspend the operation of USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and instructions;

"10) coordinates the activity of state organs to ensure the defense of the country; is the supreme commander in chief of the USSR Armed Forces, appoints and replaces the supreme command of the USSR Armed Forces, and confers the highest military ranks; appoints the judges of military tribunals;

"11) holds talks and signs the USSR's international treaties; accepts the credentials and letters of recall of diplomatic representatives of foreign states accredited to it; appoints and recalls the USSR's diplomatic representatives in foreign states and in international organizations; confers the highest diplomatic ranks and other special titles;

"12) awards USSR orders and medals and confers USSR honorary titles;

"13) decides questions of admittance to USSR citizenship, withdrawal from it, and the deprivation of Soviet citizenship and the granting of asylum; grants pardons;

"14) declares general or partial mobilization; declares a state of war in the event of a military attack on the USSR and immediately refers this question for examination to the USSR Supreme Soviet; declares martial law in particular localities in the interests of the defense of the USSR and the security of its citizens. The procedure for introducing martial law and the regime thereof are determined by the law.

"15) in the interests of safeguarding the security of citizens of the USSR, gives warning of the declaration of a state of emergency in particular localities and, if necessary, introduces it at the request or with the consent of the supreme soviet presidium or supreme organ of state power of the corresponding union republic. In the absence of such consent, introduces the state of emergency and submits the adopted decision for ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet without delay. The USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on this question must be adopted by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of its members.

"In the cases indicated in the first part of this point, can introduce temporary presidential rule while observing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the union republic.

"The regime for a state of emergency, and also for presidential rule is laid down by law;

"16) in the event of disagreements between the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities that cannot be eliminated via the procedure envisaged by Article 117 of the USSR Constitution, the president of the USSR examines the contentious issue with a view to formulating an acceptable solution. If it is not possible to reach consensus and there is a real threat of disruption to the normal activity of the USSR's supreme organs of state power and management, the president can submit to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies a proposal regarding the election of a new USSR Supreme Soviet.

"Article 127 (4). The president of the USSR heads the Council of the Federation, which comprises the supreme

state officials of the union republics. The supreme state officials of autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs are entitled to participate in sessions of the Council of the Federation.

"The Council of the Federation: examines questions of compliance with the union treaty; elaborates measures to implement the Soviet state's nationalities policy; submits to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities recommendations on resolving disputes and settling conflicts in interethnic relations; and coordinates the union republics' activity and ensures their participation in resolving questions of unionwide significance within the competence of the president of the USSR.

"Questions affecting the interests of peoples who do not have their own national state formation are examined in the Council of the Federation with the participation of representatives of these peoples.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairmen of the chambers are entitled to take part in sittings of the Council of the Federation.

"Article 127 (5). A USSR Presidential Council operates under the president of the USSR, its task being to elaborate measures to implement the main directions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy and ensure the country's security.

"Members of the Presidential Council are appointed by the president of the USSR. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers is a member of the USSR Presidential Council ex officio.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to participate in sittings of the USSR Presidential Council.

"Article 127 (6). The president of the USSR holds joint sittings of the Council of the Federation and the USSR Presidential Council.

"Article 127 (7). The president of the USSR, on the basis of and in execution of the USSR Constitution and USSR laws, issues decrees that are binding throughout the territory of the country.

"Article 127 (8). The president of the USSR has the right of inviolability and may only be replaced by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the event of his violating the USSR Constitution or USSR laws. This decision is made by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the initiative of the Congress itself or of the USSR Supreme Soviet by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of deputies, taking into account the findings of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

"Article 127 (9). The president of the USSR may entrust the execution of his duties under Points 11 and 12 of Article 127 (3) to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the duties under Point 13 of Article 127 (3) to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"Article 127 (10). If the president of the USSR is for any reason unable to continue to execute his duties, until the election of a new president his powers are transferred to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, or if that is not possible, to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. In this case the election of a new president of the USSR must take place within three months."

4. In connection with the addition of Chapter 15 (1), "The President of the USSR," to the USSR Constitution, amendments and additions are to be incorporated in the following articles of the USSR Constitution:

1) Part 1 of Article 77 is to read:

"A union republic participates in the resolution of questions coming under the jurisdiction of the USSR at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of the Federation, the USSR Government, and other organs of the USSR."

2) In Article 108:

Point 6 is to read:

"6) Election of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet";

Points 7 and 8 are to be deleted;

Point 11 is to read:

"11) The election of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee on the submission of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet";

Points 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are to be renumbered Points 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively;

the following words are to be deleted from Part 4: "resolutions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the recall of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet or his first deputy are adopted by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of USSR people's deputies."

3) Parts 4 and 5 of Article 110 are to read:

"Regular sittings of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies are held at least once a year. Extraordinary sittings are convened on the initiative of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the proposal of one of its chambers, the president of the USSR, or at least one-fifth of the USSR people's deputies, or on the initiative of a union republic in the person of its highest organ of state power.

"The first sitting of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies following elections is conducted by the

chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies, and thereafter by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

4) Parts 1 and 7 of Article 111 are to read:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet is the permanently operating legislative and monitoring organ of state power of the USSR";

"joint sittings of the chambers are conducted by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet or by the chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities by turns."

5) Parts 1 and 2 of Article 112 are to read:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet is convened annually by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet for regular—spring and fall—sessions lasting, as a rule, three to four months each.

"Extraordinary sessions are convened by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on his own initiative or at the proposal of the president of the USSR, a union republic in the person of its highest organ of state power, or at least one-third of one of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

6) In Article 113:

Point 2 is to be divided into Points 2 and 3, and is to read:

"2) appoints the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers on the submission of the president of the USSR;

"3) ratifies the composition of the USSR Council of Ministers and alterations to it on the submission of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; forms and disbands USSR ministries and USSR state committees on the proposal of the USSR Council of Ministers";

Point 3 is to be deleted;

Points 7, 13, 14, and 18 are to read:

"7) carries out, within the limits of the competence of the USSR, legislative regulation of the procedure for the exercise of citizens' constitutional rights, freedoms, and duties, ownership relations, the organization of management of the national economy and sociocultural building, the budget and financial system, labor remuneration and pricing, taxation, environmental conservation and the utilization of natural resources, and other relations";

"13) determines the main measures in the sphere of defense and the safeguarding of state security; imposes martial law or a state of emergency countrywide; declares war in the event of the need to fulfill international treaty commitments on mutual defense against aggression;

"14) adopts decisions on the utilization of USSR Armed Forces contingents in the event of the need to fulfill international treaty commitments on maintaining peace and security";

"18) has the right to revoke resolutions and orders of the USSR Council of Ministers."

7) Article 114 is to read:

"Article 114. The right of legislative initiative at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet belongs to USSR people's deputies, the Soviet of the Union, the Soviet of Nationalities, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, union and autonomous republics in the person of their highest organs of state power, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, the USSR People's Control Committee, the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR general prosecutor, and the USSR chief state arbiter.

"The right of legislative initiative also belongs to social organizations in the person of their unionwide organs, and to the USSR Academy of Sciences."

8) Article 117 is to read:

"Article 117. In the event of disagreement between the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the question is handed over for resolution to a conciliation commission formed by the chambers on a parity basis, after which it is again examined by the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities at a joint sitting."

9) Article 118 is to read:

"Article 118. A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium headed by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet is set up to organize the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium includes: the chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, their deputies, the chairmen of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other USSR people's deputies—one from each union republic, and also two representatives from autonomous republics and one from autonomous oblasts and autonomous okrugs.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium prepares Congress sittings and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions, coordinates the activity of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and organizes nationwide discussions of USSR draft laws and other most important questions of state life.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ensures publication, in the languages of the union republics, of the texts of USSR laws and other acts adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, and the president of the USSR."

10) Article 119 is to be deleted.

Article 120 is to be regarded as Article 119 and is to read:

"Article 119. The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet is elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies from among the USSR people's deputies by secret ballot for a term of five years and for not more than two successive terms. He may be recalled by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies at any time by secret ballot.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet is accountable to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet issues resolutions on the convocation of USSR Supreme Soviet sessions and instructions on other matters."

11) Article 121 is to be deleted.

Articles 122 and 123 are to be regarded as Articles 120 and 121 respectively.

12) Article 124 is to be regarded as Article 122 and is to read as two articles as follows:

"Article 122. A USSR people's deputy has the right to submit a question at sittings of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the USSR Council of Ministers and leaders of other organs formed or elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and to the president of the USSR at sessions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. An organ or official to whom a question is submitted is obliged to give an oral or written answer at the Congress sitting in question or the USSR Supreme Soviet session in question within no more than three days.

"Article 123. USSR people's deputies are entitled to be relieved of the performance of their official or production duties for the period necessary to implement their activity as deputies in the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, commissions, and committees, and also among the population.

"A USSR people's deputy cannot be subjected to criminal proceedings, be arrested, or incur judicially imposed administrative penalties without the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet or, in the period between its sessions, without the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium."

13) Articles 125, 126, and 127 are to be regarded as Articles 124, 125, and 126 respectively.

14) In Article 124:

Points 2, 3, 4, and 5 are to read:

"2) at the proposals of no less than one-fifth of USSR people's deputies, the president of the USSR, and the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, [the Constitutional Oversight Committee] submits findings to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies regarding the correspondence between USSR laws and other acts adopted by the Congress and the USSR Constitution.

"On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, submits findings regarding the correspondence between decrees of the president of the USSR and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws;

"3) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, or the supreme organs of state power in the union republics submit findings to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet regarding the correspondence between union republic constitutions and the USSR Constitution and between union republic laws and USSR laws;

"4) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of no less than one-fifth of the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR or the supreme organs of state power in the union republics submit findings to the USSR Supreme Soviet or the president of the USSR regarding the correspondence between acts adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers and draft acts submitted for consideration by these organs and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and also the correspondence between resolutions and instructions adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet; on the correspondence between USSR and union republic international treaty and other obligations and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws;

"5) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, the president of the USSR, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the chambers' standing commissions, USSR Supreme Soviet committees, the USSR Council of Ministers, the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, the USSR People's Control Committee, the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR prosecutor general, the USSR chief state arbiter, all-union organs of public organizations, or the USSR Academy of Sciences submit findings regarding the correspondence between normative legal acts adopted by other state organs and public organizations to which supervision by the prosecutor's office does not apply under the USSR Constitution and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws."

15) Parts 1 and 2 of Article 125 are to read:

"The Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet monitor all the state organs accountable to them.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet and the president of the USSR direct the activity of the USSR People's Control Committee."

16) Parts 3 and 4 of Article 130 are to read:

"The USSR Council of Ministers reports on its work no less than once a year to the USSR Supreme Soviet and regularly briefs the president of the USSR on its activity.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet can on its own initiative or at the proposal of the president of the USSR express no-confidence in the USSR Government, which entails the latter's resignation. A resolution on this question is adopted by a majority of no less than two-thirds of the total number of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

17) In Article 131:

Part 1 is to read:

"The USSR Council of Ministers is empowered to resolve all questions of state management under the jurisdiction of the USSR insofar as, under the USSR Constitution, they do not come within the competence of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the president of the USSR";

Points 3 and 4 of Part 2 are to read as follows:

"3) takes steps to ensure citizens' rights and freedoms, defend the interests of the country, and safeguard property and public order;

"4) takes measures to ensure the country's defense and state security";

Point 5 is to be deleted;

Points 6 and 7 are to be regarded as Points 5 and 6 respectively and are to read:

"5) takes general measures in the sphere of relations with foreign states, foreign trade, and Soviet economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation with foreign countries; takes measures to ensure the fulfillment of the USSR's international treaties; ratifies and denounces intergovernmental and international treaties;

"6) forms committees, main administrations, and other departments under the USSR Council of Ministers if necessary."

18) Article 133 is to read:

"Article 133. On the basis and in execution of USSR laws, other decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and decrees by the president of the USSR, the USSR Council of Ministers issues resolutions and instructions and verifies their implementation. Resolutions and instructions issued by the USSR Council of Ministers have binding force throughout the territory of the USSR."

19) Part 4 of Article 135 is to read:

"USSR ministries and state committees bear responsibility for the condition and development of the spheres of management entrusted to them; within the limits of their competence, issue acts on the basis and in execution of USSR laws, other decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, decrees of the president of the USSR, and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and instructions; and organize and verify their implementation."

20) Parts 1 and 5 of Article 152 are to read:

"All courts in the USSR are formed on the basis of the principle of the election of judges and people's assessors, with the exception of the judges of military tribunals";

"The judges of military tribunals are appointed by the president of the USSR, while people's assessors are elected in an open ballot by servicemen's meetings."

21) Article 171 is to read:

"Article 171. The USSR national anthem is approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet."

III. 1. To establish that the first president of the USSR is to be elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies for a five-year term.

Candidates for the post of president of the USSR in these elections can be put forward by social organizations through their all-union organs, the USSR Supreme Soviet, each of its chambers, groups of no less than 100 USSR people's deputies, and union republics in the person of their supreme organs of state power. The candidate who receives more than half the votes of the total number of USSR people's deputies is deemed to be elected. If none of the candidates collect more than half of the votes during the poll, there is to be a runoff between the two candidates who collected the greatest number of votes.

2. The person elected president of the USSR assumes office from the moment of swearing the oath.

The following is ratified as the text of the oath taken by the president of the USSR:

"I do solemnly swear to loyally serve the peoples of our country, to strictly abide by the USSR Constitution, to guarantee the rights and freedoms of citizens, and to conscientiously fulfill the lofty duties incumbent upon me as president of the USSR."

IV. To bring this law into force from the moment of its adoption.

M. Gorbachev,

Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Moscow, Kremlin, 14 March 1990.

Reaction To Gorbachev Election Analyzed

LD1503231590 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] The election of the first executive president in this country is undoubteldy a major victory for democracy and a step towards building a law abiding state. But some factors, as our parliamentary correspondent Maksim Tkachenko points out, prompt a critical approach.

Noteworthy is that even with the easily predicted election results the chief architect of perestroyka collected a relatively small majority of the vote. One reason for that is that Mikhail Gorbachev was the only candidate for the presidency. The two other candidates nominated at the congress declined to contest the election, underlining that political opponents to Gorbachev have never emerged in the nearly five years of reform.

The Deputy Prime Minister Dr. Leonid Abalkin explains this by the fact that for all these years the Communist Party has monopolized power: The question could be only that of comparing the personal qualities of people and this does not provide much political choice, said Dr. Abalkin. Real elections and real alternatives are possible only when there will be competition not so much between people as between different programs and ways of resolving issues. All this will appear only when a multiparty system becomes a reality. Up till now, continued Dr. Abalkin, the entire structure of the Soviet political system has virtually excluded the appearance of new leaders and alternative elections. No wonder, as it was at the start of perestroyka, the fate of reforms and the fate of the nation largely depends today on that of one leader—Mikhail Gorbachev.

When the new post of president was introduced there was an exception for him to have the right to be elected in the legislature rather than by the people. Many law makers were displeased with that, but their calls to deny such a right to the first Soviet president proved unpopular, as one of the radical legislators Nikolay Ivanov, an investigator, explained: Today even in a remote village where hardly anyone reads anything it's next to impossible to explain why someone has been elected not by all the people, reasons Ivanov. If elections were held for the entire people to take part Gorbachev would never be elected. My view, he continued, is that is was out of the fear of this that he decided to carry his candidature through the parliament, where he enjoys popular support.

Some law makers censured the presidential status law as imperfect legislation hastily drafted on the eve and during the Congress. However the majority of legislators approved the law, as they endorsed the right of the first president to be elected in the legislature. The law makers were guided by the need to introduce presidential rule immediately. They argue that this is to consolidate executive power and enable it to solve social, economic and ethnic problems more effectively, as the law maker Roland Bykov, a distinguished film director and actor, has said in an interview: If we look at what happened from the angle of how presidential elections should be held the law certainly leaves much to be desired, said Bykov. The candidates' program should be thoroughly debated and there should be worthy contender and various parties to contest for power. All this is so, but that is for the future. The extremely tense situation in this country does not allow us to talk about the ideal conditions of parliamentary activity. So, continued Roland Bykov, complaints voiced on this score to the congress look like grievances expressed to a man in the (?trenches) during a battle when he is told that he is not cleanly shaven today. I regard the election returns as fair and the only ones possible. And those views from the actor and film director Roland Bykov end this report from our parliamentary correspondent Maksim Tkachenko.

Gorbachev on Need for Supreme Soviet Chairman

LD1503151190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 15 March carries a report by commentator Olga Vasilenko on this morning's session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Following recordings of Deputy Osipyan's report on the presidential election results and Gorbachev's taking of the oath, she says: "The complexity of the situation that has arisen was discussed at a meeting of the previous membership of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev actually discussed." There follows a voice recording of Gorbachev.

Gorbachev says: "During the preparation of the draft law on the introduction of the presidency, we envisaged the whole situation: the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the government. And all those who participated—and many have participated—and all the commissions were discussing it. At all stages, the view that the Supreme Sovict should not be weakened as a result of these innovations was expressed very sharply. This theme ran through it all. It was present everywhere, and we adhered to it. I think that this was a correct formulation of the question. Moreover, when the question about having the vice-president there instead of the chairman—so that there should be no such post at all—was raised, all the Supreme Soviet commissions rejected it categorically. So there should be a chairman of the Supreme Soviet; any other approach is a blow to the prestige. Generally, so to speak, this is an independent, legislative power. That is why it should be drawn up in such a way. If the vice-president were to find himself in the capacity as chairman at the joint session, this would constitute an improper intrusion of the president's power on the Supreme Soviet. So, the question was discussed from this point of view as well. That is why, in the final count, the viewpoint—I consider this correct and have personally supported it at all stages—that there should be a chairman of the Supreme Soviet has prevailed. That's the first thing.

"Second, I think that, following the same argument, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet—for his own authority, firm tenure, and in some way, you know, his respectability among the members of the Supreme Soviet—should derive his powers from the Congress."

There follows a recording of various deputies nominating candidates for chairman of the Supreme Soviet, as listed in referent item, although Vasilenko states that 18 nominations were made and that, following withdrawals by some of the nominees, 11 contenders remained.

There follows a recording of Kazannik's address during the discussion of the candidacies. He outlines his reasons for standing, with reference to the legislative process and the draft law on the press. He continues: "Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, notwithstanding all his erudition in professional training, does not lead the sessions of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet with sufficient precision. [commotion in the hall] What do I have in mind specifically? I'll prove it, comrades. Yesterday and the day before, we have completely ignored the standing orders. According to the standing orders, we are supposed first to discuss the amendments to the draft law, and they are adopted by an absolute majority of votes, that is, 50 percent plus one vote." Vasilenko notes that Kazannik's remarks provoked controversy and that the discussion on Kazannik's candidacy continued for quite a long time, but that his name remained on the list for voting.

There follows an interview during the session interval with Deputy Kirillov, from Voronezh; and Vasilenko concludes her report, noting that the discussion of candidacies for the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet is continuing.

Congress Votes for Chairman

LD1503161690 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary corespondent:

Secret voting to elect the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet began at the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies.

Until today this post was held by Mikhail Gorbachev, but it became vacant with his election to the presidency. The functions of chairman of the Supreme Soviet have changed, however. The chairman is no longer the supreme government official, but rather the speaker of parliament.

As many as 19 candidates to the post of the chairman were nominated. Eleven of them refused to run, including the current Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev and Chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yevgeniy Primakov.

The presidium of the Supreme Soviet nominated Anatoliy Lukyanov, who until today has been first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Seven other persons were put on the secret ballot.

Except for Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, the candidates not well known to broad public and are known only to people who constantly follow the work of parliament. They are lawyer Aleksey Kazannik from Omsk, Western Siberia, teacher from Moscow University Konstantin Lubenchenko, Kiev physicist Sergey Ryabchenko, lawyer Anatoliy Sobchak of Leningrad, teacher Nikolay Fedorov from Cheboksariy, the Volga reaches, and scientist Gennadiy Filshin from Irkutsk, Eastern Siberia.

Elects Lukyanov

LD1503203690 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Anatoliy Lukyanov, new chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, spoke today in favour of political pluralism and a continuing dialogue with all forces that support perestroyka.

Addressing participants in the Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies after his election, he pointed to the "extreme importance" of organising the work of the Supreme Soviet in conditions of the emerging multiparty system in such a way as to "use to the maximum positive factors contained in political pluralism and, on the other hand, to reduce the sphere of tension caused by it."

He believes that the parliament is to play an important part in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations. Lukyanov urged both chambers of parliament, reflecting all-union and national interests, to be more active and stressed that it would enable the parliament "to adopt a law on the renewal of the union treaty in the near future."

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet believes that it is necessary to improve the professionalism of the parliament, especially in working out new laws. He also stressed the importance of strengthening its controlling functions and said that it is necessary "to build in a new way the relations both with the president and the government."

Further on Supreme Soviet Chairman Election

LD1603093490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1748 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Remarks by President Mikhail Gorbachev on the introduction of the presidency at the 15 March session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] I will perhaps make a few brief comments here to clarify matters. When we were at the state of preparing

the draft law on the introduction of the presidency, the entire situation arose and we always had in front of us the entire situation—namely, the president, the Supreme Soviet and the Government—and all those involved—and very many people were involved and all the commissions discussed it—at all stages the question was very acutely posed that as a result of these innovations the Supreme Soviet should not be weakened. This theme was present throughout and everywhere, and we adhered to it. I think that this formulation of the question is right.

Moreover when the question arose of a vice president, who would exist instead of a chairman, and of the office of chairman not existing at all, the Supreme Soviet commissions were up in arms and categorically saying that there should be a chairman of the Supreme Soviet. A different approach would be a blow to its prestige in general, so to speak, since it affects the independence of the legislative power. Therefore it should be formulated accordingly. Moreover, if a vice president ended up as chairman of the joint sittings it would be too flagrant an influence of presidential power on the Supreme Soviet.

Therefore, it was from this viewpoint that the issue was discussed and finally the viewpoint which I consider to be correct, and which I personally supported at all stages triumphed—namely, that there should be a Supreme Soviet chairman. That is the first point.

And second I feel that, stemming already from this, for the authority of the Supreme Soviet chairman, for the firmness of his position and to a certain extent, you know, for him to be respected by members of the Supreme Soviet, he should receive his powers from the Congress, in order, so to speak, to reinforce this figure.

We reflected on this for a long time comrades. Whatever new has surfaced here was in one way or another present during the discussion. I am simply letting you into these debates. I and Comrade Yakovlev—I have lost sight of him—have been carrying on polemics in order to stand up for this here. Incidentally he is aware of, and was involved in, these discussions, but probably he had the idea to do it this way.

Moscow TV Carries Congress of People's Deputies

Discuss Supreme Soviet Chairman

LD1503182190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1622 GMT on 15 March begins broadcasting a recording of the 15 March session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The recording begins by broadcasting Gorbachev's speech when accepting his election as state president. Gorbachev's speech ends at 1715 GMT. This is followed by Lukyanov announcing a 30-minute interval. The television announcer then declares a 15-minute interval in TV coverage.

The recording of the congress resumes at 1731 GMT.

Gorbachev says that as he has been elected he can no longer be chairman of the Supreme Soviet. The congress must discuss the question of electing a chairman of the Supreme Soviet. He asks who is in favor of including this on the agenda; it is put to the vote. 1833 for ; 24 against; 9 abstentions.

At 1736 GMT Gorbachev proposes an interval for deputies to discuss possible candidacies.

At 1737 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the post is still occupied. First Gorbachev must resign. Also, the question of vice chairman must be discussed.

At 1738 GMT Gorbachev agrees that things must be done formally. He asks for a legal expert to specify whether this is needed. An unidentified deputy says that it is already covered by the law and no vote is needed.

At 1739 GMT Kudryavtsev says it would be better for a vote to be taken; this is not unconstitutional. He gives three points which should be covered.

At 1740 GMT Gorbachev says that it should all be covered by one vote.

At 1741 GMT Bisher says that Gorbachev leaves the post of chairman automatically without the need for a vote.

At 1742 GMT Gorbachev says that the congress is competent to decide what to do. He calls for a vote on whether to accept Kudryavtsev's three-point plan. 1866 for; 24 against; 31 abstained.

At 1747 GMT (?Alekseyev) points out contradictions in the constitution with regard to the election of Gorbachev. The Supreme Svoiet should elect its chairman.

At 1748 GMT Gorbachev says this point has been discussed heatedly in commissions. He says that the prestige of the Supreme Soviet must be preserved. The president must not have too much power over the Supreme Soviet. He agrees that there should be a chairman of the Supreme Soviet and he should be elected by the congress.

At 1751 GMT an unidentified deputy raises the question of the rules for electing the chairman and vice chairman as they currently stand.

At 1752 GMT Deputy Ivanov recalls that Gorbachev yesterday promised to respond to questions. This seems to have been forgotten.

At 1754 GMT Gorbachev says that an attempt is being made to put pressure on the congress. Replies have been given to the questions. But he could give more replies later. We shall return to that later.

At 1755 GMT Gorbachev suggests an interval for various groups to submit their candidates. It will be 30 minutes. He calls the Presidium to meet.

Candidates Proposed

LD1503194490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1757 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev says that the congress has lost its main officials by the presidential vote, but suggests that they should remain in place temporarily. He puts this proposal to the vote.

At 1759 GMT Gorbachev raises the matter of the president's salary. Who is to decide it? The Supreme Soviet? 1663 for; 160 against; 26 abstentions.

At 1801 GMT Kudryavtsev says that the person in the chair can influence the choice of next chairman. Gorbachev promises not to.

At 1805 GMT Dzasokhov, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, says that the new chairman will have new tasks to fulfill. The new man should ensure continuity. The Presidium submits the candidacy of Lukyanov. He offers to describe his qualities. The congress declines the offer.

At 1807 GMT Stankevich puts forward two candidates: Velikhov and A.M. Yakovlev. The following proposals are submitted:
Savostyuk proposes Yu.A. Ryzhov.
Engver proposes Lukyanov and A.N. Yakovlev.
Yusupov puts forward Nazarbayev and Primakov.
Vlasenko supports Lukyanov's candidacy.
Safon proposes Nazarbayev.
Bocharov, on behalf of the interregional group, proposes Kazannik.
Levakin proposes Lubenchenko.
A deputy from Cheboksary proposes N.V. Fedorov.
A deputy proposes Sobchak.
Plotnikov proposes Stankevich and N.V. Fedorov. He explains why.
At 1816 GMT Kiselev calls attention to the standing orders with regard to these elections.
At 1817 GMT Gorbachev dismisses the complaints.
At 1819 GMT Kim, on behalf of the Soyuz group, puts forward Volskiy, Lukyanov, and Nazarbayev.
At 1820 GMT Yavorivskiy from the Ukraine puts forward Ryabchenko.
At 1820 GMT a deputy calls for an interval for individual republics to have a veto on the various candidates.
At 1821 GMT Kaznin proposes Filshin.
At 1822 GMT a Chechen-Ingush deputy proposes Kugultinov.
At 1822 GMT Kolbin is proposed by an unidentified deputy.
At 1823 GMT Zaslavskiy is proposed by a Leningrad deputy.
At 1823 GMT Kirillov proposes Lukyanov and Ryzhkov.

At 1824 GMT Gorbachev reads out the list of deputies proposed.

At 1825 GMT Gorbachev asks if the debate on the candidates for Supreme Soviet chairman can now begin: Yes.

Deputy Bazarova congratulates Gorbachev on his election as president, adding that choosing his successor is a very responsible task. The Turkmen deputy group, she says, is in favor of Lukyanov. His election would ensure continuity in the work of the Supreme Soviet. He's a man we can trust.

An unidentified deputy congratulates Gorbachev on his new post on behalf of Soviet women. The new Supreme Soviet chairman should be capable of achieving compromise: Lukyanov is the man for the job.

At 1831 GMT an unidentified deputy suggests that candidates wishing to withdraw from the election should be allowed to speak first. Another deputy proposes that at least 15 minutes discussion be devoted to each of the 19 candidates.

Deputy Primakov thanks those who put his name forward, but says he would not be capable of giving himself fully to the job of Supreme Soviet chairman, and that there are better candidates anyway. His name is removed from the list. Deputy Ryzhov likewise withdraws from the election.

Deputy Kolbin thanks those who have recommended him for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, remarking that Lukyanov, as a trained lawyer, is better equipped for the post. He wishes to continue in his job as chairman of People's Control Committee.

At 1837 GMT Deputy Kugultinov comes to the rostrum. He does not feel physically capable of doing the job. Referring to a remark at yesterday's session equating Khrushchev with Stalin, Kugultinov says this is wrong: Khrushchev was the man who opened up the labor camps and paved the way toward perestroyka.

An unidentified deputy comes to the floor to withdraw from the list of candidates.

Deputy Stankevich withdraws on the grounds that he has too little experience for the job.

At 1842 GMT Premier Ryzhkov asks to be exlcuded from the list of candidates due to other obligations. Another unidentified deputy comes to the rostrum to withdraw from the race.

Gorbachev says that A.N. Yakovlev is feeling unwell and has left the hall. He will be contacted subsequently on the subject of his candidacy. Gorbachev reads out the list of remaining candidates.

Deputy Kuznetsov says that he supports Lukyanov for three reasons: His profound legal knowledge; his capable character; and his experience. He goes on to criticize the

way in which the Supreme Soviet chambers are functioning: Many deputies are not given the opportunity to speak. The future chairman should set things to order.

At 1849, Deputy (?Shapovalenko) asks whether Lukyanov has always adhered to congress rules. At the second congress he blocked a debate on privileges and ignored numerous requests concerning public organizations. Lukyanov should not be elected as Supreme Soviet chairman.

Merits of Candidates Debated

LD1503203590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1851 GMT ON 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

An unidentified deputy speaks in favour of Lukyanov. The future Supreme Soviet chairman should ensure better organization of the committees and commissions.

At 1853 GMT a note from Yakovlev says that he is declining to stand for election.

Deputy Romanov, on behalf of the "Soyuz" group, voices his support for Lukyanov: He possesses the necessary political qualities and knows the business well. He concludes with an appeal for proper implementation of laws once adopted.

Deputy Golev calls for stability in parliamentary work, advocating Lukyanov as the best candidate.

At 1857 GMT, Deputy Romanenko says that the Ukrainian delegation, after discussion during the break, supports Lukyanov. He chides Shapovalenko for his "extremist" criticism of Lukyanov, pointing out that he has not chaired the congress singlehandedly.

Gorbachev calls a vote on ending discussion of Lukyanov's candidacy. The hall agrees that enough has been said.

Deputy Nazarbayev comes to the rostrum, thanking those who put forward his name for election. He has just been elected chairman of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet, however, and asks his supporters to vote for Lukyanov instead.

At 1902 GMT, academician Velikhov is the next candidate to be discussed.

An unidentified deputy says the discussion procedure is wrong: All candidates should be discussed together. The new chairman should be as objective and independent as possible; he should stand above the Supreme Soviet debates. For the Supreme Soviet to function properly, he should not be a close friend of the president.

Another unidentified deputy says he knows Velikhov well. He is the best candidate since, unlike Lukyanov, he has farreaching plans for reorganizing the work of the parliament. This is necessary, stresses the deputy.

Candidate Kazannik is next to be discussed. He comes to the rostrum saying he would like to be elected. He is dissatisfied with the work of the Supreme Soviet and the congress. The laws debated and adopted do not follow from life's requirements: They are foisted on reality and consequently produce poor results. Lukyanov does not chair the sessions "clearly" enough, says Kazannik, criticizing his handling of debates. As a result we are "marking time."

At 1912 GMT, Deputy Komarov says they must know everything possible about their future chairman. He knows little about Kazannik, however. Reading out an excerpt from an interview by Kazannik in VECHERNYY OMSK condemning leadership privileges and secrecy, Komarov challenges his aspersions and asks Kazannik how he intends to solve the country's problems.

Deputy Kudryavtsev comes to the rostrum. He is a supporter of Kazannik. If Lukyanov is elected, he points out, all the top state posts would be occupied by Politburo members. This is "unacceptable."

An unidentified female deputy appeals to the hall for a businesslike discussion without public defamation of the candidates.

At 1921 GMT, Deputy Ergashov speaks. Kazannik, Sobchak and Zaslavskiy do not possess the qualities for a future chairman; please vote for Lukyanov.

At 1922 GMT, DEputy Sorokin hails Kazannik as a "positive" candidate. He asks deputies to vote for Kazannik and Sobchak; a contested election is a good thing, he explains.

An unidentified female deputy praises Lukyanov as a "living encyclopedia" and a "very decent" man. If anything, he has to be even stricter. Vote for Lukyanov, she urges.

At 1924 GMT, Gorbachev asks whether enough has been said about Kazannik. Since deputy Komarov asked for Kazannik to be struck off the list of candidates. Gorbachev suggests a vote on the issue. An unidentified deputy says this would be wrong. Another deputy proposes a "more democratic" procedure. Gorbachev says that it still has to be decided whether Kazannik is included in the list of candidates or not. Deputy (Dzhanibekov) recalls that Kazannik gave up his seat in the Supreme Soviet in favour of Yeltsin, thereby forfeiting the trust shown in him. This must be taken into account now. Deputy (Sebentsov) says only the self-withdrawal of a candidate counts.

Sobchak's Qualities Discussed

LD1503204790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1933 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1933 GMT Gorbachev says that he has not heard Lukyanov or Velikhov withdraw from the contest. A female deputy says the standing orders do not cover withdrawal, only self-withdrawal. Kazannik thus cannot be withdrawn; he should be supported.

At 1935 GMT Kudryavtsev agrees with the interpretation of the rules on withdrawal. He reads out the relevant rule.

At 1936 GMT Gorbachev asks for a clarification. Candidacies need to be confirmed by the congress by secret voting.

At 1938 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the deputies should express their opinion of Kazannik in the vote and not keep on giving him publicity in the debate.

At 1939 GMT a deputy calls for the list of candidates to be confirmed, and then the voting for the post can proceed.

At 1941 GMT Deputy Zaslavskiy withdraws his candidacy in favor of Kazannik and Filshin.

At 1942 GMT Gorbachev asks for comment on Deputy Lubenchenko's candidacy. A female deputy supports Lubenchenko's candidacy. A deputy from Belorussia says that the candidates should explain their platforms.

At 1944 GMT Lubenchenko comes forward to explain his platform. He says he will do away with protectionism. He will make use of experts and professionals, examine privileges, examine the party budget, and ensure division of powers with a strong Supreme Soviet to balance the presidency.

At 1948 GMT Deputy Medvedev praises Lubenchenko. He says that Lubenchenko should be regarded as a future leader, although this time he will vote for Lukyanov.

At 1950 GMT, a deputy praises the qualities of Lubenchenko but calls for Kazannik to be included in the list.

At 1952 GMT Deputy Prokushev says Lubenchenko is capable of doing the job.

At 1953 GMT Deputy (Krashnikov) supports Lubenchenko.

At 1954 GMT Gorbachev says the next candidate to be discussed is Fedorov.

At 1955 GMT a deputy says that more young people are needed to promote perestroyka. He praises Fedorov's qualities.

At 1957 GMT Deputy Valentinov praises Fedorov.

At 1958 GMT Belorussian Deputy Podberezskiy praises Fedorov.

At 1959 GMT Fedorov outlines his platform; he calls for an independent legislature.

At 2002 GMT Deputy Borovik recalls that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet will be the president's deputy.

At 2003 GMT Gorbachev asks if all the remaining candidates should remain. The hall says they should. A deputy criticizes Sobchak and says he should not be a candidate; he had insulted the Adigey people.

At 2007 GMT a deputy supports Sobchak and praises his qualities; he did not insult Yakutia at all.

At 2008 GMT a deputy points out the qualities needed by a chairman.

At 2009 GMT Deputy Andreyev speaks on behalf of veterans. He condemns Sobchak, whose insults yesterday show his character and render him unsuitable. He supports Lukyanov.

At 2011 GMT a deputy says that elections should be contested.

At 2012 GMT a deputy says the two best qualified candidates are Lukyanov and Sobchak; but the best character is Lukyanov.

At 2013 GMT, a deputy praises Lukyanov's qualities.

At 2015 GMT Gorbachev says he thinks the deputies want to finish, but he will allow Akhromeyev to speak.

At 2016 GMT Akhromeyev says that Sobchak is an impossible candidate, sarcastic and cruel in polemics. Moreover, he does not support the armed forces.

At 2017 GMT, Sobchak comments on the criticism that has been voiced about him. He now wishes to express his opinion about the parliament. It should be independent, professional, and democratic. All members should be allowed to speak. Parliament needs a different kind of apparatus to the present one. On the subject of his alleged insults of Ryzhkov and the Adygey people, he is ready to apologize if necessary, but a reading of his words will show that he did not insult them; this is particularly true of what he said about the Adygey and other peoples.

At 2022 GMT Gorbachev consults as to how to continue.

At 2023 GMT Deputy Ryabchenko explains his platform. He has great respect for Lukyanov. Although he, Ryabchenko, is little known by comparison, he is ready to compete for the post. A stable Supreme Soviet is necessary for proper law-making; the future chairman must reorganize it on a more "scientific" basis as a working body.

On Lithuania's 'Rash' Move

LD1503211890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2027 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev says that candidate Filshin is next on the list. Everyone knows him well enough, and there is no need for discussion. As the hall votes to confirm the list of candidates, Gorbachev announces a break. There is a two-minute break in television coverage.

At 2030 GMT the recording of the congress resumes.

Votot nikov is in the chair. 1,725 deputies register as present. Vorotnikov declares the sitting open and gives the floor to Osipyan, head of the tellers' commission. Osipyan explains the voting slips and procedure: secret ballot; winner gains over 50 percent; repeat vote if no result.

At 2037 GMT, Vorotnikov announces that the sitting will continue in one hour's time. The deputies head off to vote in Georgiyevskiy Hall.

A two-minute break in TV coverage follows.

At 2039 GMT the recording of the evening sitting commences. Vorotnikov has the chair. He announces that a draft congress resolution has been prepared on the decisions adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. Nishanov is to speak on it.

At 2040 GMT Nishanov takes the floor to read out the draft resolution: The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has declared Lithuania's independence; "illegal steps" that might be "fraught with danger" for Lithuania and the entire country. This will cause damage to Lithuanian in many fields. It represents "contempt" for the interests of the other republics. It may lead to new interethnic conflicts and a "general destabilization" of the situation, upsetting the European equilibrium. The decision has been taken at a time of renewal of the Soviet federation.

"Numerous" letters are coming to the congress condemning this "rash" move by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. The decision does not have legal force. Lithuania has been a component of the USSR since 1940, the Lithuanian delegates have participated in running the country. Lithuania today is "organically linked" with the rest of the country. The 1978 constitution of Lithuania confirms its status as part of the USSR, thereby delegating decisions on independence to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The congress of USSR People's Deputies states that the Soviet constitution still holds in Lithuanian territory. The independence declaration "must be rejected"; it is "invalid." The congress instructs the government to examine the situation immediately and adopt the necessary measures to ensure adherence to laws, security of the country and protection of property in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The congress appeals to all citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republlic to display "reason" and remain within the renewed Soviet federation.

At 2051 GMT, Deputy Boldarev asks how the congress can ignore the freely expresed wish of the Lithuanian people. What will happen if the Lithuanians persist?

At 2052 GMT, Nishanov says a mechanism is being drawn up for secession from the USSR. Secession cannot be carried out by "ultimata"; it must be done properly. Sajudis, he says, obtained approximately 30 percent of votes in the Lithuanian elections while around 20 percent supported the pro-CPSU Lithuanian Communist Party. This has to be taken into account.

At 2056 GMT, an unidentified deputy in army uniform asks whether the congress is to debate the Estonian issue separately. Nishanov says the resolution only concerns Lithuania. The supreme Soviet will discuss each republic's problems individually. Deputy Starovoytova from the floor says the centre does not have the right to ignore the wishes of the republics. Could not a compromise be found through negotiations, despite Gorbachev's rejection of the idea? Nishanov replies that everything must be handled within the framework of the Soviet constitution. The center is not refusing talks, on the contrary, a secession mechanism is being drawn up.

At 2101 GMT, an unidentified deputy asks who wrote the draft resolution. Nishanov says he and Primakov drew up the first draft and then submitted it to the Supreme Soviet presidium for finalization.

Deputy Obolenskiy from Kaliningrad Oblast says his constituency is closely affected by the Lithuanian decision. To adopt such a resolution on the basis of a single reading would be "extremely dangerous." Should not the newly elected USSR president handle the issue? Nishanov says this is no simple matter. The interests of the Soviet Union are at stake, as are the rights of millions of citizens. There is nothing wrong with the draft resolution.

Deputy Desyatov asks what efforts the Soviet of nationalities has made to find a common language with the Lithuanians. Nishanov says the Soviet of nationalities has not been able to sit, as the congress is being held. This is the better forum, he says.

An unidentified deputy asks whether the incorporation of Lithuania in the USSR in 1940 was legal; has this been examined? Nishanov replies that the events of 1940 were enshrined by official state documents and there is no reason to review them now. The draft resolution, however, gives a clear assessment of those events. In response to a remark on emotions, Nishanov says the resolution is based upon facts, not emotions.

Requires 'In Depth' Discussion

LD1503214390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2111 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

An unidentified deputy says that it is up to the Presidential Council to resolve conflict situations and give recommendations to the Supreme Soviet. This should be done now, in line with the amended constitution. Nishanov replies that the congress is the supreme state body and can handle any issue.

A Latvian deputy asks about the money paid by Stalin to Hitler for Vilnius Oblast. Lithuania was incorporated in the USSR in a matter of two months; why must its secession be a long drawn-out affair? Nishanov answers that these issues need to be discussed "in depth."

At 2114 GMT, Vorotnikov intervenes to say that various documents have been circulated, allowing deputies to assess the situation.

Deputy R. Medvedev says he is "deeply distressed" by the draft resolution; it is "harsh" and and may cause an opposite reaction. Nishanov agrees with Medvedev's suggestion that such matters should be decided by a nationwide referendum. Deputy Kazyrev says he is unhappy with two elements of the draft. It says nothing of the Hitler-Stalin pact and makes too much reference to "certain forces." It is "too categorical" and will merely complicate the situation.

At 2119 GMT Nishanov says that everyone naturally has his own view. The draft resolution takes into account the "acuteness" of the issue, which make account for its "harshness." The Lithuanians have confronted us with the matter very "harshly," however. He mentions that hundreds of union enterprises are located on Lithuanian territory. These and other issues must be studied by the government. Deputy Sorakin stands up to say that both the Lithuanian decision and the draft resolution are "ultimate" and that fuller information is needed before proceeding further. Nishanov replies that every since the first congress, information on the Lithuanian situation has been circulated and discussed.

At 2122 GMT Vorotnikov interrupts to stress how many people are concerned over the situation, brandishing bundle of letters as evidence. A Lithuanian deputy gives the voting figures for the Lithuanian election, declaring that Sajudis does not have the right to speak on behalf of the Lithuanian people. A deputy from Kazakhstan comes to the rostrum to warn of the consequences of the congress decisions; they will affect millions. He supports the draft resolution, however, while warning against unnecessary emotion.

Deputy Ivanov, in naval uniform, is next to speak. On behalf of all servicemen, he congratulates Gorbachev on his election as president. The Armed Forces will continue to serve the people faithfully, he states. The Lithuanian decision "darkens" the historical changes taking place in the country today; it is a result of the "extremism" and "selfishness" of the Sajudis leadership, and is "betrayal" of the Lithuanian people. It is a "knife in the back" of the Soviet people and puts Kaliningrad Oblast in a "most severe" situation, as it now has no border with the Soviet Union. Ivanov suggests that the congress adopt a decision anulling the Lithuanian people on independence. Representatives of the Soviet Union and foreign states should be present to prevent pressure on the voters. He concludes by demanding a "corridor" linking the Soviet Union with Kaliningrad Oblast.

More on Lithuania's 'Pernicious' Move

LD1503230290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2134 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Bronshteyn urges deputies not to adopt the resolution for the following reasons: The Lithuanians are not present in the hall; and a "hasty" resolution now will preclude rational agreement in the future. The Lithuanians, he adds, are interested in "economic union" with the USSR, and therefore possibly in a "political union." An unidentified deputy suggests that the whole issue should be discussed in the Soviet of Nationalities.

At 2137 GMT Deputy Orlov comes to the rostrum. Refuting those who claim that the situation has not been sufficiently examined, he recalls that Gorbachev and many others have visited Lithuania. On behalf of the Council of Veterans he supports the resolution; the Lithuanians must realize what "pernicious" repercussions their decision will have. Many Lithuanians requested incorporation into the USSR back in 1940.

Deputy N.N. Medvedev from Lithuania says that in 1940 the Soviet Army invaded Lithuania. Elections were then held, but those who did not participate were declared "enemies of the people." The fascists destroyed 200,000 Lithuanians, the Bolsheviks "twice as many" and their bones are still being returned from Siberia. The situation in the republic today is "under control" and no "dangerous flareups" are expected. This document may, however, be the catalyst for such. Medvedev urges everyone to think hard before adopting the document: it will not make life better for russians living in Lithuania. He suggests that a negotiating group be set up.

At 2144 GMT Vorotnikov invites Semenov to the rostrum. Semenov, from Belorussia, says he understands the Lithuanians; all republics want to control their own affairs. The Belorussians and Lithuanians set up a common republic in 1919; Vilnius was the capital. Close ties remain to this day. At the same time, says Semenov, the Hitler-Stalin pact should have been reviewed long ago, as it has been exploited for political purposes. He

regrets Lithuania's declaration of independence. In a historical digression on history of Lithuania, he says that in 1940 approximately 3,000 square km of Belorussian territory were handed over to Lithuania: if Lithuania denounces the treaties of 1940, Belorussia too will have to review its position on the territorial issue.

At 2152 GMT Deputy (Tikhonovich) speaks about Polish territory split between Lithuania, Belorussia, and the Ukraine in 1939. A press article last year said around 40,000 Poles were deported at that time. This is false: "up to 2 million" Poles were deported and the remainder were deprived of rights. (Tikhonovich) requests that the Supreme Soviet remember that there is a Polish community in the Vilnius area, which would like to establish an autonomous Polish okrug. A referendum is essential in Lithuania. Dozens of people who are uncertain of the future have asked him to speak on their behalf, stresses (Tikhonovich).

At 2158 GMT Deputy Petrushenko, in army uniform, demands that the congress make a decision on the Lituanian question. The Lithuanians are like children misbehaving while their parents' minds are on other matters. He denounces the fact that Lithuanians are deserting from the army. The draft resolution must be adopted. If the Lithuanians secede, there are good legal grounds for dividing up its territory amongst other republics; Belorussia has a claim, for instance. There is loud applause from the hall.

At 2202 GMT Deputy Shchelkanov appeals for calm.

At 2204 GMT Vorotnikov announces a 20-minute break. A one-minute break in TV coverage follows.

The TV relay resumes at 2205 GMT. Vorotnikov reads out a telegram from Klaipeda shipyard denouncing the Lithuanian independence decision and demanding that the congress protect Soviet citizens' interests. Similar telegrams follow. There are "masses" of them, says Vorotnikov.

At 2208 GMT Deputy Yarovoy from Tallinn says, let us not be naive; the Baltic republics began violating the USSR constitution back in 1988. The draft decision must be adopted immediately. He is surprised that representatives from proletarian Leningrad are supporting Lithuanian independence. Already now there are no Russian street signs to be seen in Tallinn; things must not go on this way. A referendum on independence should be held in Estonia, as it would give people a chance to think the issues through. The Lithuanian breakaway is a "disgrace" for such a "humane" country as the Soviet Union. Yarovoy winds up by asking how many of the deputies have actually lived in Estonia, as he has.

Lithuanian Declaration 'Provacative'

LD1503233590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2214 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow. Deputy Kurdyumov from Riga is next to speak. For Latvia to secede, he says, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies must give the go-ahead, on the basis of a decision of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. He calls for less emotion, proposing a three-point statement: Each nation has the right to self-determination; the Lithuanian Supreme Sovet has the right to raise the issue of secession, but cannot do so by way of ultimatum; and instructions must be given on negotiations.

At 2219 GMT Deputy Falin comes to the rostrum. He supports the previous speaker. Certain inaccuracies must be cleared up, however. The issue of Lithuanian independence was resolved during World War One and confirmed in the Treaty of Brest. Disregarding this would be wrong. The Hitler-Stalin pact of August 1939 made no mention of incorporating the Baltic republics into the USSR. Hitler used that incorporation as a pretext for aggression. Medvedev's figures and Tikhonovich's version of Polish-Soviet history are refuted; Poland committed agression first. Adopting a hasty resolution will change none of these historical complexities, says Falin. Everything must be studied calmly. He proposes a draft decision: Congress of People's Deputies regards Lithuanian decision as illegal; the Soviet constitution still applies in lithuanian territory; the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the USSR should take measures to protect rights and freedoms etc. in Lithuania; the congress hopes that mutual goodwill will lead to a solution.

At 2231 GMT Vorotnikov wonders how many more speakers should be heard; four, say the deputies.

Deputy Roy Medvedev takes the floor. Things are far more complex than the draft decision suggests. Falin has provided historical facts. A "brief" and "calm" "appeal" should be adopted, throwing out at least two thirds of the draft resolution text. That resolution says nothing of the "terrible repressions" against Lithuanians in 1940-41, indicates Medevdev. [applause] He backs the statement proposed by Falin.

At 2235 GMT Deputy Bykov is next. Why concentrate on that one document 50 years ago, he asks? There are numerous other historical documents. The Potsdam agreement is the relevant one now. Secession of a republic is a right that must be confirmed by the congress. The reference to the Hitler-Stalin pact is nothing but a "political ruse" and should be rejected. We must adopt an appeal to Lithuania to resolve the issue in a specified way. Threats from us would be "premature."

At 2241 GMT Deputy Maslyukov speaks on the economic aspects of Lithuanian independence. Cutting of economic links would be very costly. Lithuania would be obliged to compensate the Soviet Union for expenditure on settling non-Lithuanian refugees from the republic. Compensation for loss of defense and transport facilities is needed too. The total estimated compensation bill

would be around R18-20,000 million. Maslyukov reads out an appeal from Landsbergis to Ryzhkov asking for existing economic ties to be maintained until treaties are drawn up. Excerpts from Lithuania's economic plans are read out: importation of raw materials from USSR, export of finished goods to the USSR, then to the West as quality improves. The idea is clear, says Maslyukov. Summing up, he says the Lithuanian declaration is "provocative" and was adopted "behind the congress's back."

Lukyanov Elected Chairman

LD1503234390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2248 GMT on 15 March continues broadcasting a recording of the 15 March USSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Kogan, from Estonia, is the last to speak. Discrimination against non-indigenous inhabitants of the Baltic republics is rife, he says. People are asking to be evacuated from those conditions of "constant psychological terror." Complaining that his previous speeches have been edited out of the TV relays, Kogan says the congress is trailing behind events, "as usual." He proposes three additional points for the draft resolution: Take all measures to protect citizens' rights in Lithuania; impose direct presidential rule in Lithuania before an independence referendum; and hold an immediate Supreme Soviet debate on the Baltic situation. Estonia may repeat the Lithuanian option soon, warns Kogan. If we fail to adopt a decision today, we will have to take care of a flow of refugees tomorrow, he concludes.

At 2254 GMT Gorbachev sums up. The congress must not end without taking a stance on the Lithuanian issue: otherwise people "would not understand the congress." We are correct to debate the problem. Europe and the whole world must be taken into account in the discussion. We have been very patient, says Gorbachev, but we are now seeing processes that "must be stopped." While respecting the Lithuanian people and distinguishing them from those who are driving the republic "into a dead end" we must help by being "principled" and "firm." The draft decision proposed could be modified along the lines suggested by Falin. Gorbachev reads out a new draft, close to Falin's, point by point. It declares the Lithuanian decision invalid; the Soviet constitution remains in force in Lithuania; instructions are to be given to USSR president to secure rights of all citizens on Lithuanian territory. [applause from hall]

At 2304 GMT Vorotnikov calls for a vote on the Gorbachev option. Result: 1,463 for, 94 against, 128 abstentions. Decisions adopted.

At 2308 GMT Osipyan, chairman of the Tellers' Commission, announces the result of the election of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. 1,896 deputies wee given voting slips; 1,890 slips were cast; six were invalid; the votes were as follows: Velikhov: 60 for, 1,824 against; Kazannik: 75 for, 1,809 against; Lubenchenko: 377 for, 1,507 against; Lukyanov: 1,202 for, 682 against [applause]; Ryabchenko: 26 for, 1,858 against; Sobchak: 77 for, 1,807 against; Fedorov: 39 for, 1,845 against; Filshin: 22 for, 1,862 against.

Lukyanov received the vote of 53.6 percent of deputies on the list and is therefore elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [applause] Lukyanov takes a bow.

At 2313 GMT Vorotnikov calls for a vote to confirm Osipyan's report. It is confirmed.

At 2317 GMT Lukyanov comes to the rostrum. He says: Thank you for your support; I will do all I can to vindicate your trust. The Supreme Soviet and Congress of People's Deputies are developing well; numerous laws and decisions are already adopted. "Far more" remains to be done, however. The Supreme Soviet must show tolerance towards new political forces and conduct a dialogue with all pro-perestroyka forces.

At 2322 GMT Lukyanov says that utmost respect must be shown for all nations and ethnic groups. The chambers of the Supreme Soviet must function more efficiently. Real internationalism is required. Some of our laws, says Lukyanov, are "abstract" and devoid of a proper enforcement mechanism. We must be more "professional" in our law-making. The Supreme Soviet must learn to reach the correct conclusions on all the problems it handles. It must act as a single team in which each plays a role. I am convinced, says Lukyanov, that we can work hand in hand for the sake of the people and perestroyka. [applause]

At 2326 GMT Vorotnikov says all points on the agenda have been dealt with. The congress is declared closed. The national anthem is played.

At 2329 GMT final intimations from Vorotnikov: Supreme Soviet to sit at 1000 on Monday 19 March.

Coverage of Gorbachev's News Conference Featured

Discusses Soviet Jewish Emigration

LD1503214990 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the desire today that the Arab countries should not suspect the Soviet Union "of some specific intentions" in connection with the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. The USSR is approaching the problem from the position of all-human values, from the position of the international law. The Soviet Union brought its legislation into line with it.

Speaking today at his first press confernce as president of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev answered the question on his ideas about the settlement of the problem that

emerged as a result of the settlement of Soviet emigrants on Israeli-occupied Arab lands.

The Jewish emigration from the USSR is "more dynamic now than before," he said. However, "Moscow believes that in the near future the process will become more calm." The Soviet Union is not evading the exchange of views on these problems with the parties concerned. They should be settled on the basis of mutual understanding, in the spirit of cooperation, the Soviet president stressed.

Desires Arms Pact During U.S. Visit

LD1503215590 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—Executive President of the USSR Mikhail Gorbachev believes that a great package of problems will be discussed during his forthcoming visit to the United States and that important negotiations be held.

Speaking at a news conference in the Kremlin on Thursday, he expressed the hope that a considerable degree of accord about 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms will be achieved by that time.

He said this process intensified again, which imparts hope that it will be possible to outline the contours of a treaty by the summit meeting.

Gorbachev expects an exchange of opinion about the development of the European process to take place in Washington. "We have always thought that the United States and Canada should participate in the European process," he emphasised.

Among other themes for discussion Gorbachev mentioned questions associated with chemical weapons, exchange of opinions on the termination of nuclear testing, regional problems.

"I believe we come to realise that there is a need for a serious talk about the widening of economic cooperation," the Soviet president said.

Confident of Improved PRC Relations

LD1503213290 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the confidence that relations between the Soviet Union and China will be stable and will make progress. He gave his first news conference as executive president of the USSR in the Kremlin on Thursday.

Gorbachev emphasised that the visit of the premier of China's State Council to the Soviet Union, being prepared now, will be [a] major event. It will give a fresh impetus to relations shaping after Gorbachev's visit to China last year.

"We highly appreciate these relations and treasure them, and we shal be doing everything to ensure their progress," the Soviet president said.

He noted that a multitude of problems of bilateral relations and of the situation in Asia and the Pacific will come up for discussion during the forthcoming visit.

On Military Reform, Modern Weapons

LD1503211490 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—The implementation of the new Soviet military doctrine requires the restructuring of the Soviet Armed Forces, Mikhail Gorbachev said on Thursday at his first news conference as executive president of the USSR.

The military reform should proceed in the context of the real situation in the country and the world, the Soviet president said.

"As a result of the defence reform we should have a contemporary Army which should be distinguished by at least two essential aspects: it must be well trained and it should be equipped with up-to-date effective weapons," the Soviet president said.

Speaks on European Security Policy

LD1503212690 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS Parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—"The problem of the reunification of Germany is exactly the case when we should think carefully in order to avoid wrong steps and the upsetting of balance," Mikhail Gorbachev said at a press conference in the Kremlin today.

Answering a question about the Soviet Union's policy in Europe, the Soviet president stressed the need to give a new character to the existing blocs and to create new structures. Aside from the existing military alliances, he believes that in this way "a whole system will be created, on the basis of which a new building of European security can be formed."

"By going though the Vienna process, through the Helsinki process, by taking new steps towards unification and the consolidation of economic, trade, scientific and technological relations, we shall move towards Europe and the security that have a solid basis," Gorbachev said.

Congratulates Eastern Nations New Year

LD1503220590 Moscow TASS in English 2143 GMT 15 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—Speaking in the Kremlin on Thursday at his first conference as president of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev congratulated Eastern nations on the coming holiday of Navrus—the holiday of Spring and the New Year in many Muslim countries and in Soviet Central Asian republics.

The Soviet leader said that the Eastern nations were united by the common striving for peace and a better life, and expressed hope that these aspirations would come true.

Gorbachev Meets Yazov, Servicemen in Kremlin

LD1503210390 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met servicemen, who are members of the Soviet Parliament, at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses today.

On behalf of the soldiers of the Army and Navy, General Dmitriy Yazov, Soviet defence minister, congratulated Gorbachev on his election as the first president of the USSR.

During the talk Gorbachev strongly appreciated the role and importance of the Armed Forces as a guarantor of the country's security. As the Army and Navy are being reduced, he emphasised the need to enhance their qualitative parameters, discipline and organisation.

Gorbachev shared thoughts about political bodies' work in the new political situation in the country and the sweeping and progressive military reform that should enhance the Army's combat might, rather than weaken it, and the personnel's professionalism.

The talk concerned the development of a government programme to enhance the social protection of servicemen and members of their families. Gorbachev stressed that the Army was most closely linked with the people, shared all of society's concerns and was going through the same difficulties.

"Although we are slashing funds for defence and implementing conversion, we continue to develop promising research projects in the field of defence. We cannot weaken the defence of the country.

"Much criticism of the Army is heard now. Given the contradictory nature of arguments, criticism is useful, in principle. The voice of society should be heard. But the Army should receive criticism calmly and draw correct conclusions. Calm in the Army means calm in the country," Gorbachev said.

Participants in the meeting said that the Army should be used for what it is assigned to do, especially when it concerns situations generated by the aggravation of inter-ethnic relations.

Gorbachev said that as the president of the USSR and supreme commander-in-chief of the USSR Armed Forces, he would show continuous concern about strengthening the country's defences, and expressed confidence that the servicemen of the Army and Navy would befittingly perform the tasks faced by them.

Congress Informed of Party Support for Gorbachev

LD1403203190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] The evening session [of the Congress of People's Deputies] was opened by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. He gave the floor to Deputy Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko who spoke on behalf of participants of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. This is what he said:

[Begin Ivashko recording] The second session of the March plenum of the CPSU Central Committee has just taken place. In accordance with the third part of the law adopted today, the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee examined the question of the candidacy for the post of president of the USSR. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was unanimously put forward as a candidate for the post of president of the USSR. [applause]

During the discussion of this question, the comrades who spoke drew attention to the great contribution that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has made to the renewal of our society and of our life. Being the author and the initiator of perestroyka, in the foreign political arena and inside the country he is implementing that policy persistently and consistently. In the event of the election of Comrade Gorbachev as president of the USSR, he, in the opinion of those who spoke, should carry out a number of serious measures in the sphere of the economy, in the internal political life, and raise the authority of our country in the international arena. I ask you to support these decisions of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. [end recording]

Martirosyan on Presidential Power Issue

LD1403235190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2055 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Remarks by Deputy V.A. Martirosyan at the 14 March session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades, we are living in nightmarish times, in a nightmare country, and we are governing by nighmarish methods. We have had imposter presidents in our country, who arrived imperceptibly. One left as a tyrant, the second left under ridicule, the third left in disgrace. These were Stalin, Krushchev, and Brezhnev.

Mikhail Sergeyevich came with hope and gave the people a breath of fresh air. The people are waiting to recover their breath. I hope that, Mikhail Sergeyevich... [Martirosyan changes thought] If trust is shown, he must finish things so that the people are finally able to recover their breath.

I wish, as a military person, to give an order, because in our country people are used to looking down upon the army. When you look down on the army from above, only the life of the generals can be seen, and the army needs to be looked at from below. From here the life of the warrant officers, ordinary soldiers, and sergeants can be seen. I have an earnest request: It is necessary that all issues, especially those relating to the life of our warrant officers today, be specifically resolved. Dear comrades, I consider that Mikhail Sergeyevich must strengthen friendship between the peoples. Today, whatever happens, it is necessary to return to the issues of Sumgait, Fergana, Dushanbe, and other issues. I consider that in order for more benefit to be brought into our country, it is essential that Gdlyan and Ivanov be returned so that they may continue to uncover all of the mafiosi existing in our country, starting with those in the armed forces, and those in other places. Thank you.

Congress Approves Presidency Amendment

LD1403222990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1807 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Remarks by Deputy Kudryavtsev, chairman of the Drafting Commission, with interjections by M.S. Gorbachev at the 14 March Congress of USSR People's Deputies session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Gorbachev] The floor is given over for a report from the drafting commission to its chairman, Deputy Kudryavtsev.

[Kudryavtsev] Esteemed comrade deputies. We obviously did the right thing in using the lunch break to examine the written submissions. I should tell you that we received over 200 different suggestions. We tried to look at them all. [passage omitted]

There are a number of suggestions which we regarded as reasonable and which we would now like to put to the congress for its consideration. I would like to bring to your attention eight such proposals, so I shall now set them out for you.

First, concerning the article about the presidency; basically, all of this concerns the presidency. In Article 127 (1)—regarding the election of the president—we agreed the following addendum: "The election of the president of the USSR is regarded as valid provided no less than 50 percent of electors take part in it." I would imagine this sentence will not arouse any doubts; it seems natural it could not be otherwise. [passage omitted]

[Kudryavtsev] The next relates to Article 127 (3) point six, regarding the powers of the president. This contains a list of posts for which he can nominate candidates to the Supreme Soviet for endorsement, and to the congress for relieving such officials of their duties. Where relieving such officials of their duties is concerned, it is now proposed here that that right should not be accorded to the president in relation to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court. The reasoning here is that if we are pursuing the principle of division of authority, then the president should not be, so to speak, above the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court. Therefore, the end of the sentence in point six of Article 127 (3) will read as follows—I'll first read the text as it stood before: "...to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Congress of People's Deputies concerning relieving the aforementioned officials of their duties," comma and now comes the new wording "with the exclusion of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court." [passage ommitted]

[Gorbachev] The amendment is passed. [passage omitted]

Congress Debate on Presidency Issue Reported

PM1503140790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents N. Krivomazov, O. Losoto, et al on Congress of USSR People's Deputies proceedings: "The Congress Votes for the President"]

[Excerpts] Let us talk about a critical, even dramatic moment at yesterday's sitting. Deputy G. Novikov took the floor and made a statement which made the audience catch its breath. "In my view," the speaker said, "in its examination of the draft law [on the presidency] and its vote on it the Congress has significantly strayed from or, to be more accvurate, has contravened the existing standing orders."

G. Novikov explained that the adoption of the draft law in a single reading at the Congress is out of step with Articles 133, 135, and 137 of the standing orders, which stipulate the adoption of laws in two readings. The Congress can only adopt draft laws on first reading if it sees no need to amend them. The draft under consideration is not subject to the action of Article 137 and must, in my opinion, be given two readings."

The speaker also noted that the procedure for voting on the draft law, carried out yesterday, 13 March, is completely at odds with Articles 140 and 142 of the standing orders, in which it is pointed out that first there is a vote on each amendment and only then are the articles and the draft law as a whole put to a vote. I would point out that the draft law as a whole will still be adopted, by a vote, irrespective of what amendments are adopted.

Therefore the deputy proposed that Congress adopt the following resolution: "The Congress resolves that the results of the 13 March vote on the draft bill, which contravened Articles 140 and 142 of the standing orders, be declared invalid, in accordance with Article 137 of the

Congress of USSR People's Deputies standing orders. Second, in accordance with Articles 133 and 135 of the standing orders, the draft law should be sent back to the Supreme Soviet for further work by the committees and commissions, identyifing and taking into account the opinion of union and autonomous republics and entities, as indicated in Articles 123 and 136 of the Constitution, and the draft law should be considered in a second reading at the next Congress of People's Deputies."

It was this that made the audience catch its breath. But not for long. Because it realized what was really behind the legal prestidigitation and casuistry: The forces behind the deputy, those who had incited him to make this statement, were going for broke, so to speak. It was essentially a last desperate attempt to nullify the previous two days' work at the Congress, simply to disrupt it and postpone it to a later date. But the deputies realized this. [passage omitted]

Deputy T. Avaliani opposed M.S. Gorbachev as a candidate. He cited the deterioration of the socioeconomic situation in the country, the exacerbation of interethnic relations, and the delay in tackling certain political questions. Deputy V. Logunov criticized the delay in devising a new USSR Constitution and called for a vigorous effort to prepare new documents. Deputy N. Kutsenko used an expression that was, in our view, not entirely appropriate for parliament, when he called the debate a spectacle. He also warned that he did not intend to vote on the matter, explaining that the events in Lithuania and its parliament's decisions are reason enough for both candidates, M. Gorbachev and N. Ryzhkov, to withdraw their candidacies.

Deputy A. Shchelkanov also criticized M. Gorbachev. In his view, M. Gorbachev has done very little to reform the party, while he has been leader, and, as head of the Constitutional Committee, he has been in no hurry to start work on a new Basic Law for the country.

In our view, the latter charge is not entirely correct. B. Topornin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute visited the PRAVDA editorial office recently. He said that the creative collective had already devised and presented to the Constitutional Commission a prospectus for a new USSR Constitution. We say this because much of the criticism of the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman in deputies' speeches, unfortunately, has not always been corroborated by concrete, persuasive arguments.

It is hard, for example, to accept that M. Gorbahcev presented the initiatives on a major reduction of USSR Armed Forces and rescheduling of developing countries' debts without consulting anyone, that because of him there has been a dragging of feet in situations like the "Karabakh crisis." [passage omitted]

Discusses Presidential Powers

LD1403132990 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—The Soviet Congress of People's Deputies today continued discussing the bill on the powers of the new executive president. During the first two hours of work more than 20 amendments were discussed, but almost all of them were rejected.

The age limit for the presidential post was hotly debated. The bill says that a Soviet citizen aged from 35 to 65 can be elected president. David Kugultinov, a writer from the Kalmyk autonomous republic, suggested that the upper limit be lifted. He recalled how effectively Konrad Adenauer, Charles de Gaulle and Ronald Reagan performed their duties, despite their old age. Academician Yevgeniy Ginzburg supported him. He suggested that all age limits be lifted. However, this amendment did not get the required majority of votes.

The proposal on the obligatory declaration of income by a president was also rejected. However, on the initiative of Mikhail Gorbachev who actively supported the declaration of incomes (he told the congress yesterday that he received a salary only as a member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and refused to receive the salary of president of the Supreme Soviet) the congress asked parliament to discuss this proposal once again.

Few deputies supported the proposal of a group of Latvian deputies to merge the two new authorities subordinated to the president—the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council.

Discusses Election of President

LD1503003790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1856 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Discussion of the presidential election process at the Third USSR Congress of People's deputies held in the Kremlin on 14 March—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Gorbachev] Let us move on to section three. You have this document on the last page. So, section three: To establish that the first president of the USSR is elected by the Congress of People's Deputies for a period of five years. Candidates for the office of president can be nominated in these elections by public organizations in the person of their all-union bodies, by the Supreme Soviet and each of its chambers, by groups of USSR People's Deputies numbering no fewer than 100 people and by the union republics in the person of their supreme bodies of state power. The candidate who receives more than one half of the votes of the total number of USSR people's deputies is elected. If none of the candidates gains more than half the votes in a ballot, a repeat ballot will be held between the two candidates who gained the most votes. That was the first point. The second is that the person elected USSR president assumes office from the moment of taking the oath. We are to endorse the

following text of the oath of the USSR president, taking further discussion into account. There, basically, is section three in its entirety. I can see that we must vote on the section. Is that the case? And then look at the amendments? As we have before.

[Shchelkanov] Shchelkanov, Leningrad. Esteemed people's deputies, yesterday we received information from the secretariat that there are a good many objections to these documents, submitted to the secretariat by the population of our country. Many objections were raised by the item about the draft law on the election of the first USSR president by the Congress of People's Deputies. Many people believe that the election of the first president should be direct and secret and on a contested basis. I ask the secretariat and the congress to back me and to provide us with precise details of what the people have said, for and against. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Does anyone else have anything to say, comrades? Just a moment, I have given the floor to Comrade Yeliseyev. You may speak next.

[Yeliseyev] Comrade deputies, we are now approaching a moment of great responsibility. I would appeal to you to approach it with particular care. We have received an address from the deputies of Estonia which says in the last or the penultimate paragraph that while giving general support to Gorbachev's political line and to the restructuring he initiated, we can only sincerely regret the fact that our attitude to the institution of presidential office in the USSR and to Gorbachev personally can in the present instance be only of a general political and moral character. That is, deputies, they are telling us that they do support the line adopted in theory but that basically they cannot take part in a vote. All in all, on the very point of adopting this issue about 300 people are not now going to play an active role in the voting. I have great respect for my colleagues from Lithuania and Estonia, but I would propose in this specific instance, and taking into account the special importance of the matter, that we should adopt a decision by two thirds of the votes of those who are taking an active part. Otherwise we get ourselves into a tricky position in this fundamental and crucial situation.

[Gorbachev] Just a moment. You've been out here before. Comrade Sobchak also has to speak.

[Nikolskiy] Deputy Nikolskiy, Leningrad. Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed comrade deputies. I am an ardent supporter of the presidential form of government. I made a speech at the second session of the Supreme Soviet and spoke about this. I came here in order to vote for the presidential form of government as I already have, and I inclined towards voting for the president's being elected at the congress, even though many of my constituents insist that voting must be that of all the people. All the same, I believed that taking into account the present situation in the country, we could vote at the congress, and all the more so when a multiparty system has not yet developed here, nor have real conditions for an authentic contested ballot. I am now however—prior to embarking upon a vote on this complex and difficult matter—experiencing certain doubts. This doubt arose after the results of voting yesterday on the question of the possibility of combining the office of head of state and party leader.

A paradoxical situation arose. This key issue was effectively decided by a minority of the congress. A majority of the congress opposed such a combination as being inexpedient. All the same, this decision was adopted as a possibility even though this issue is of concern to a great many of the voters, and when combining party and state power in one persons hands is both inexpedient and impermissible. When we are given examples that in many countries the head of the party can be or is the president, the fact is not taken into account that an entirely different party structure exists there, and that the party there has quite different possibilities and quite different power. I therefore think we have to decide this key problem before we make a decision on how to vote on section three. [passage omitted]

[Sobchak] Esteemed comrade deputies. As we come to a vote on section three, we are deciding, essentially deciding in advance, the fate of the presidential office and the question of reforming our state system. I should like to recall my standpoint which I expressed at the Supreme Soviet session. My position consisted of not electing the president but of endowing the chairman of the Supreme Soviet with appropriate powers. Now, aware of the full responsibility to the people and to history for the decision we are adopting, I should like to say the following and to call upon you to act as follows. In almost all the speeches, we have heard assertions that today we have a paralysis of state power. We have adopted a decision ourselves to amend Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution which means the dismantling of the system of power, party power essentially, power whereby the party was a substitute for the state. It is natural that in these conditions there cannot be an instant change or an instant transition of the state from one situation to another. This will take time.

Let us now think whether a clause, which is in theory correct and irreproachable on the possibility of the entire population of the country electing a president, could be carried out in our actual conditions? On the one hand we have an undoubted paralysis of state executive power, and on the other a situation in which an emergency situation has been introduced in a number of areas of the country, and when a number of state formations which are part of the union have already made the decision to leave it on a unilateral basis. I would remind you of the decision of the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic, that of the Lithuanian Republic, and the address from the Congress of Estonia—different versions but essentially the same thing. In these conditions then, we are faced basically with the question of preserving our union state, that of guaranteeing the legitimate interests of each Soviet citizen living in each republic, and the interests of

the entire union state while dealing with such matters as the question of secession or of exclusion from the union.

I would not like you to view my speech as an appeal to preserve the union, come what may. Each people within our union has the right both to leave and to deal independently with matters of its existence as a state. I repeat, however, that this is only within the framework of the law and only by constitutional means. I can see no other way today of solving this matter than at the Congress of People's Deputies by means of electing the first president at the congress. I shall be voting for the matter to be decided like this, and I call on you all to do the same.

Second, it is a question of what voting should be like. Do we need two thirds or do we need a simple majority? This question is a purely legal and technical one, and I should like to give it the required explanation. [shouts from the floor] Just a couple of words comrades. If we now approve or adopt section three, in connection with the fact that it envisages amendments to the constitution already adopted, we shall require two thirds of the votes on section two which we have already adopted. If we first vote for section four on the procedures for introducing amendments to the constitution, which have already been introduced—I recall that this reads that amendments to the constitution adopted by the congress are valid from the moment of being adopted—there is one article, Article 121, point one, parts two and three, to the effect that a president is elected by a direct, equal, and universal ballot of the population, and with regard to this, I propose that their introduction be timed to follow the election of the first president, so that a simple majority of votes will be sufficent to elect a first president.

Further on Debates on Post of President

LD1403174190 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 14 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary secretary]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—A multi-party system has not yet taken shape in the Soviet Union, and Mikhail Gorbachev, if elected president, should retain the post of the Soviet Communist Party general secretary, Deputy Svyatoslav Feodorov, the famous eye specialist, told journalists here today.

"I believe," he told correspondents before the morning session of the Third Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, "that under present conditions Gorbachev should continue leading the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. He may only leave the post when other parties are established and a new alignment of forces is formed".

Feodorov believes that Gorbachev's first steps as president should be aimed at "using his powers to settle disputes, sharply aggravated recently, between the centre and union republics".

The president, he said, should also prepare state structures to enforce the law on ownership and the fundamentals of legislation on land, recently promulgated by the country's parliament.

Speaking about the procedure for electing president, Feodorov stressed that it should be a nationwide election. However at this point, taking into account the specific situation in the country, the president should be elected immediately by this Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, he said.

Feodorov also said that he expected 70 to 75 percent of Soviet People's deputies to vote for Gorbachev during the forthcoming ballot.

Deputy Anatoliy Ananiev, a writer, views the situation in a similar way. Expressing the hope that Gorbachev will be elected president, he noted that "there is no other leader at this point who can propose a better programme than Gorbachev's".

Ananiev believes that apprehensions relating to Gorbachev filling two posts simultaneously—president and party general secretary—"are groundless". As the monopoly on power is coming to an end in this country, he said, there is no reason for fearing the combination of powers. He also noted that "in the Soviet Union, as in other civilised countries, the president does not only represent himself, and, emblematically, the nation. He must stand for the idea his party, one party among other parties, puts forth and supports, and he must head this party."

Deputy Pavel Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, formulated the idea in his own manner. He told correspondents that "holding the two posts—president and party general secretary—is only justifiable until the party's 28th Congress".

Bunich voiced hope that the situation in the party will change so considerably at the 28th Congress "that Gorbachev will no longer need the post and it will be filled by another man".

Vlasov Defends Election of President by Congress

PM1303101390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

["On the Spot Interview" with A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and USSR people's deputy, by unidentified PRAVDA parliamentary correspondent; place and date not given, under the rubric "At the Congress of USSR People's Deputies: A. Vlasov: 'Let Us Be Realistic'"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The presidential form of rule—will it be effective, will it justify the hopes pinned on it? This would depend to a considerable extent on intrafederation ties and primarily on the status of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet

Federated Socialist Republic] in the future USSR. This was the topic of conversation between PRAVDA's parliamentary correspondent and USSR People's Deputy A.V. Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

[Correspondent] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, one of the main arguments against an immediate introduction of the institution of presidency boils down to a claim that the federal structure's future is unclear....

[Vlasov] Let us begin with the question whether the presidential form of rule is better able to accelerate the transformation of the Union's political-federal structure than is the activity of the current USSR Supreme Soviet. In my view, the answer to this can only be affirmative. Without equally strong presidential power, strong legislative power is nothing but fiction. Judging by A.I. Lukyanov's report, the questions of federal reorganization will comprise one of the future president's main and immediate concerns. I am convinced that the election of the president and the creation of new institutions of power will also make it possible to elaborate a law on the USSR and to renew the treaty of the union. Actually, it will not only accelerate but will also bring order into this work.

[Correspondent] What is your attitude toward the proposal to simply change the position's title from chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet to president, and give him certain additional powers?

[Vlasov] My impression is that the originators of this idea have not taken into account the fact that we are not talking about a position but about a new institution of power. A certain "power vacuum" has actually developed in the conditions when, in essence, the CPSU Central Committee's direct influence on state and government decisionmaking is coming to an end. It is clear that we cannot go on like this for very long. The entire logic of the democratic process leads us to the necessity to create the post of head of the Soviet state vested with adequate powers and authority.

In our view, the draft law under discussion ensures that the president will play the role of guarantor of the observance of Soviet citizens' rights and freedoms and of the USSR Constitution and laws.

[Correspondent] There are many doubts also as regards the form of electing the first president at the congress....

[Vlasov] The immediacy of introducing the presidency is dictated by the most complex sociopolitical situation. We are at the critical point. The threat of perestroyka getting bogged down, of its common sense getting drowned in soapbox oratory, outright pessimism, and pseudodemocratic phrasemongering has perhaps never before been so acute and obvious. People are becoming increasingly aware that there is nothing more frightening than absence of authority [bezvlastiye] with the ensuing total license and anarchy. This is confirmed by some quite serious sociological polls. I cannot agree with those who dispute the legitimacy [pravomernost] of the first USSR president's election at the current congress, and insist on direct general elections. Let us be realistic. The completion of elections to republic and local soviets and the holding of their first congresses and sessions will take at least two more months. Naturally, a parallel presidential election campaign is out of the question now. Moreover, we have absolutely no experience in organizing direct presidential elections.

Congress Draft Resolution on Lithuania

LD1603115490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Draft resolution adopted by the Third Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow on 15 March; read by Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities —recorded]

[Text] Having met hastily on 10-12 March before the end of the elections, the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's Supreme Soviet declared the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian state and the abolition of the operation of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's and the USSR's Constitutions on the republic's territory. Thus, unlawful steps, which can be fraught with serious consequences for the Lithuanian people and for our whole country, have been taken to separate the republic from the USSR. What is more, certain political forces are trying to deprive the peoples of Lithuania of their right to make a really democratic choice, knowing at the same time the truth about the damage which will be incurred by Lithuania's split from the USSR in the economy, politics, social relations, and for people's personal futures. These decisions represent a disparaging attitude toward the lawful interests of other republics and the USSR as a whole. They are breaching the rights of citizens of all the nationalities residing on that territory, deeply affecting the feelings of the Soviet people, who have given 138,000 lives to liberate Lithuanian territory from Hitlerite fascism. This could lead to fresh interethnic conflicts and general destabilization in the situation, and could have a negative effect on the political, military, and strategic situation on the European continent, which has taken shape as a consequence of the results of World War II and postwar development. That decision is being made during the time when the process of radical transformation of all walks of life in Soviet society is underway, including interethnic relations; when the Soviet people have firmly embarked upon the path of a consistent and unswerving democratization of this mutlinational state; of the renewal of the Soviet Federation; and when the USSR Supreme Soviet has begun consideration of the laws aimed at expanding the rights of the union republics and enhancing their sovereignty.

Numerous letters and telegrams are coming in to the Supreme Soviet from that republic and other regions of the country. They are condemning this rash step by the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

The Congress of People's Deputies believes the above mentioned decisions of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet have no lawful juridical force. The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic was received as part of the USSR at the request of the Lithuanian Sejm by the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1940. With all their further activity during half a century, the supreme bodies of the state power and administration of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic have been confirming that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic is part of the USSR.

The population of Lithuania elected its deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and subsequently to the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and they took part in resolving the most important questions of state life of the country.

The republic's economy developed as a part of the national economic complex of the country, receiving considerable aid from other republics which ensured its accelerated development. No one can fail to take into acocunt that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic is organically linked today with other republics of the country, with living ties on the uninterrupted functioning of which the vital activity of its national economy directly depends.

The fact of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's location within the USSR with the rights of a union republic was officially confirmed once again by the Constitution of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic of 1978. Consequently, questions of the self-determination of the republic can be resolved in no other way than on the basis of the Constitution of the USSR. While having the constitutional right to self-determination, a union republic, both in joining the federation and in leaving it cannot ignore the political, socioeconomic, territorial, legal, and other problems which arise as a result of such action.

Taking account of what was has been set out, the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR states that in accordance with Articles 74 and 75 of the USSR Constitution, the sovereignty of the USSR and the operation of the USSR Constitution continue to extend to the territory of Lithuania as a union soviet socialist republic. The attempt to present the congress with a fait accompli by means of adopting decisions unilaterally must be rejected.

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolves, guided by Articles 73, Point 11, and 108 of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that the legislative acts of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic on 12 March 1990 on the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian state and on the abolition of the effect of the USSR Constitution on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic are deemed invalid [nedeystvitnelnyy]; resolves to instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of other union republics, to urgently consider questions that have arisen in the situation and to adopt measures in accordance with the USSR Constitution and laws that are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, the constitutional structure, the country's security, property, and other state interests of the USSR on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies at this crucial time appeals to all citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, to Lithuanians, Russians, Poles, Belorussians, Ukrainians, Jews, and representatives of other nationalities, to all political forces and public movements, to display prudence and a feeling of responsibility, to support the policy of consolidation of the free and equal republics in the framework of a federation that is being renewed, the policy of strengthening the Soviet multinational state.

Gorbachev Speaks on Lithuania

LD1503203190 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—A thorough debate was held at the Congress prior to the adoption of the Resolution on Lithuania. The results of the debate were summed up by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

He emphasized that the Congress cannot conclude its work without stating its attitude to the situation connected with the decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

The president said the Congress received a multitude of telegrams attesting to extreme anxiety over what is taking place in Lithuania.

People will disapprove if the Congress did not discuss this matter and state its attitude, the president said.

Discussing this problem we should visualise Lithuania, the whole country, Europe and the world, Gorbachev said.

"No one should simplify this question. We have shown extreme patience and show it today... At the same time, we have approached the landmark beyond which processes start which should be arrested. There are already signs of these processes. We must state this outright to the Lithuanian people, to the whole country and the world," Gorbachev said.

"The Congress and all of us, expressing the will of the Soviet people, are respectful of the Lithuanian people and do not mix them up with those who push them into a historic impasse and who can jeopardise the destiny of the Lithuanian people," the president said.

"We must help the Lithuanian people and even many of those whose activity is associated with such questions... I think we can do so by combining in our approach two

important aspects: respect and patience, but at the same time manifesting principledness and firmness," Gorbachev said.

The Congress adopted the draft resolution proposed by the president.

Majority Adopts Resolution

LD1503201790 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Extraordinary Congress of Soviet People's Deputies today proclaimed invalid the legislative acts of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet adopted on March 10-12, which proclaimed the restoration of independence of the Lithuanian State, and abrogated the operation of the Constitution of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and of the USSR Constitution on the republic's territory.

The resolution adopted after a prolonged debate by the supreme body of state authority declares that the decisions adopted in Lithuania have no legal power.

The Congress declared that the sovereignty of the Soviet Union and the operation of the USSR Constitution continue to apply of the territory of Lithuania as a Union Soviet Socialist Republic.

The resolution was adopted by 1,463 votes with 94 votes against and 128 abstentions.

Until the parliament and government adopt appropriate decision on this matter, the president of the USSR is authorised to ensure the protection of legal rights of every person residing in the territory of the Lithuanian Republic and ensure the observance of rights and interests of the Soviet Union and of Union Republics in Lithuania's territory.

Before the Resolution was adopted, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev set out his viewpoint on this problem.

Nishanov Reads Rejection of Lithuanian Decisions

LD1503173590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 15 March carries a four-minute report by correspondent Ruvinskiy on the Congress of People's Deputies.

Ruvinskiy begins by noting that another sitting of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies began 10 minutes ago. On the subject of electing a Supreme Soviet chairman, he says that 19 deputies have been put forward; eight remain in the list, that is, Velikhov, Kazannik, Lubenchenko, Lukyanov, Ryabchenko, Sobchak, Fedorov and Filshin. He says that voting papers have been handed out and counting is underway.

Ruvinskiy states that Vorotnikov is chairing this particular sitting. Vorotnikov said that: "In accordance with Congress instructions, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, chairmen of the chambers jointly with the USSR Government have prepared a draft decision in connection with the decisions adopted in Lithuania." Ruvinskiy continues: "The floor was given to Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. He read out the draft which says that the decisions adopted recently in Lithuania may lead to an exacerbation of both the interethnic and international situation." Ruvinskiy says that many letters and telegrams are coming in from Lithuania and other regions of the country to the Congress, condemning Lithuania's decisions.

Ruvinskiy goes on: "And further, Comrade Nishanov read out the decisive part of that document."

The report then carries a recording of Nishanov speaking: "The USSR Congress of People's Deputies resolves, guided by Articles 73, Point 11, and 108 of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Constitution, that the legislative acts of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of 12 March 1990 on the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian State and on the abolition of the effect of the USSR Constitution on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic are deemed null and void; resolves to instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of other Union Republics, to urgently consider questions that have arisen in the situation that has come about; and resolves to adopt measures in accordance with the USSR Constitution and with USSR laws that are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, the Constitution system, the country's security, property, and other state interests of the USSR on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies, at this crucial time, appeals to all citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, to Lithuanians, Russians, Poles, Belorussians, Ukrainians, Jews, and representatives of other nationalities, and to all political forces and public movements, to display prudence and a feeling of responsibility, and to support the policy of the consolidation of the free and equal republics in the framework of a federation that is being renewed, strengthening the Soviet multinational State." Ruvinskiy ends his report by saying that Nishanov is now answering deputies' questions.

Medvedev Opposes 'Trifling' points of Order

LD1403132590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0930 GMT on 14 March, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a 3-minute review by announcer Leonid Yelin and correspondent V. Tsygankov of yesterday's and today's sessions of the Congress of People's Deputies. The review begins by recalling yesterday's events and then Tsygankov presents a video report on this morning's debates. He notes that at the morning

session "the voting by name continued on the adoption of amendments to the articles in Section Two of the draft on establishing the institution of presidential power in our country. These mainly concerned the status and powers of the president. The following amendments are among those that have been adopted by Congress: The number of candidates for the post of head of state is not to be limited; Clear and extensive descriptions in individual articles dealing with the introduction of a state of emergency or martial law."

Amendments designed to remove the age restriction on eligibility for voting for a president were not approved by the deputies, Tsygankov continues. These had been proposed by deputies Kugultinov, Andreyeva, and Ginzburg. Deputy Zaslavskaya's amendment on removing the wording on citizenship was also unsuccessful, while Deputy Novikov stated that the order in which the voting was taking place at congress nas not in line with the standing order that had been adopted. Tsygankov reports. Roy Medvedev objected to this point of order. He says: "They are quite deliberately trying to divert us from deciding the fateful law which we are adopting today, by confusing things with an endless number of points from a standing order which we ourselves adopted. We, the Congress of people's Deputies, are a supreme body which sets standing orders for itself, which establishes laws by itself, and establishes the Constitution by itself. For this reason, I call for this amendment to be rejected, and I appeal to the deputies at Congress not to waste their energy on trifling matters. [words indistinct from hall; bell rings] Yes. We have not gathered for the last time. We have not assembled the Supreme Soviet for the last time, either. Individual matters relating to the adoption of the law on presidential power can be refined, and these refinements can be adopted at the next Congress, or whenever a constitution is being adopted in the future."

This amendment was rejected, the reporter says, and concludes by noting that the voting on the draft law's articles is continuing.

The video shows Gorbachev and various speakers, including David Kugultinov, addressing the assembled deputies, Medvedev delivering his speech, and the voting board.

Deputy's Proposal to 'Save Time' Rejected

LD1403224690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1742 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Speech by A.F. Kruglov, deputy from the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, with remarks by M.S. Gorbachev, at the 14 March Congress of USSR People's Deputies session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Kruglov] Deputy Kruglov from the 317st territorial constituency. Esteemed deputies, esteemed chairman: In connection with this congress having examined the very important draft law on the Constitution, and the fact that we failed to be a little embarrassed afterwards at how hurriedly and quickly we are taking such serious decisions, I have a specific proposal. In view of the fact that all our debates could come to nothing, I have the following proposal, that for the moment we stop dealing with this section and move to that on electing a president, either at the congress or by the entire people, and decide that issue. That we then decide the issue of the length of a president's term of office and come back later to this issue, that is, the second section. I think we would save a lot of time by doing this because you can see for yourselves how the debate is going on.

[Gorbachev] Thank you. I think we had agreed to proceed section by section. Nonetheless, we have a proposal and it must be voted upon. Should we call a vote? [shouts of "no"] or continue as we had agreed [shouts of "yes"] All the same there is a proposal from a deputy and I am putting it to the vote. Who is for accepting or rejecting it. Please vote. Who is for, and who is against.

The proposal is rejected. Deputy Bisher has the floor and I would ask you to proceed by article. I will deprive anyone who holds up the procedure of the floor since the congress has expressed its will.

Deputies Explain Their Vote on Congress Agenda

PM1303104590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[N. Musiyenko account of interviews with USSR People's Deputies V. Pavlov, V. Romanov, and N. Petrov under the rubric "At the Congress of USSR People's Deputies": "Deputies' Stance"—no place or date of interviews specified]

[Text]

"For"

V. Pavlov, forge and stamp operator from Novocherkassk City, Rostov Oblast: I fully supported the congress agenda. The situation now prevailing in the country is such that we simply need a president. And he should be elected as soon as possible. If general presidential elections were to be scheduled now, there would be a considerable risk of the upper hand being gained by those who adhere to antiperestroyka positions. I think that deputies who enjoy the people's trust will be able to make the correct choice.

I can see only M.S. Gorbachev in the post of the country's president. There is much in his favor. It was he who launched perestroyka, it is he who drives it forward step by step. Thanks to him, our country's prestige abroad has grown immeasurably. We know what we can expect from this man. Stability in politics is very important for us all. I very much hope that Mikhail Sergeyevich, relying on support from all sober-minded people, will be able to lead our country out of the crisis

and to solve the burning economic, social, and interethnic problems. His burden will not be light but, as the saying goes, you must set out in order to reach your destination.

"Against"

V. Romanov, chairman of Kemerovo Oblast Trade Union Council: I voted against the congress agenda in the form it was presented by the chairman. I believe that we must, without fail, put every item on it to the vote. I am primarily worried by the election of the president. After all, a decision has yet to be made on the form in which the law on instituting the post of president will be adopted, and if it will be adopted at all. Will the people's deputies agree to the proposed procedure for the election of the head of state? I, for example, will not agree. First, we arrived at the congress totally unprepared for making a decision on this question. The draft law was published in the press only on 6 March, and just a few days later deputies were already flying to Moscow. Naturally, they did not have an opportunity to properly discuss it with the voters. Second, we must finally, once and for all, give the people an opportunity to decide their own future for themselves. This is a question of principle. I am, of course, in favor of strong presidential authority. But the head of state must be elected only in an election by the whole people.

"Abstained"

N. Petrov, director of the Yakutsk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] sovkhoz named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR: Why did I abstain? Item three on the congress agenda is formulated too categorically: "Election of President of the USSR." It should probably have been worded differently: "On the Election of President," and then we would have been able to have a discussion on ways to elect the head of our state without determining the deputies' decision in advance. For example, I am in favor of the president being elected by the whole people in direct, equal, and secret elections. There should be no exceptions at all to this rule. This is a question of principle, because "exceptions' in such matters could cost society dearly. Ultimately, every citizen is entitled to ask: Did I elect this president? The solution to this problem must be approached in a very considered manner, without haste, in order to avoid feeling awkward when coming face to face with one's voters later on. In the end, we could give the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet additional powers temporarily, until the president is elected by the whole people.

Aims of Soyuz Deputies' Group Explained

PM1403201090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel N. Petrushenko, member of the presidium of the "Soyuz" deputies' group, by unnamed parliamentary correspondent under the rubric "We Introduce a Deputies' Group": "Soyuz Is...."—date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Introduction]

[Text] Among the participants in the debate on the question of making amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution and instituting the post of president was Yu. Blokhin, a representative of the Soyuz deputies' group. His speech contained many constructive proposals, and it was he who submitted alternative candidacies for the post of president of the USSR. But it seems that by no means all the congress participants know what kind of deputies' group Soyuz is, whom it represents, and what its political platform is. This was even mentioned from the congress platform. We expect the same questions have occurred to many KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers. Our parliamentary correspondent met with Col N. Petrushenko, member of the presidium of the Soyuz deputies' group, and asked him to answer some questions.

[Petrushenko] First of all I should say that our group was organized strictly in accordance with the standing orders of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The preparatory work on setting it up began from the moment of the election of USSR people's deputies, because even then many of us were acutely aware of the need to strengthen the federation and step up the struggle against separatism. If you are interested, the idea of forming the group actually came from Deputies V. Alksnis and V. Yarovoy.

[Correspondent] All the same, Nikolay Semenovich, what were the political motives behind the emergence of the deputies' group?

[Petrushenko] The motives lie primarily in the fact that the sociopolitical, economic, and interethnic situation in the country is extremely strained and is increasingly escaping from the control of the legitimate organs of power both centrally and locally. It is not hard to see that forces far removed from democratic principles are conducting separatist, nationalist activity that is destabilizing the situation in the coutnry and having a devastating effect on our federation. Because of the underestimation of the dangers inherent in these processes, inaction on the part of the organs of power, and failure to adopt the necessary preventive measures, many seats of interethnic conflict arose, which have resulted in casualties. Broad strata of the population feel anxiety and uncertainty about their future. All this represents a real threat to the integrity of our state, the processes of perestroyka and democratization, and the reforms that have begun.

[Correspondent] What aims did you set yourselves in forming the deputies' group?

[Petrushenko] First and foremost we sought to unite within our ranks the USSR people's deputies who recognize the principle of the federal state structure of the USSR and the country's unity. We are opposed to all manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism, and racism

or other actions aimed at increasing tension in the union or leading to the proliferation of undemocratic phenomena.

[Correspondent] What are the main points of the political platform of the Soyuz deputies' group?

[Petrushenko] Our group recognizes the paramountcy of human rights and the equality and free development of all citizens of the Soviet Union throughout its territory regardless of nationality, language, religion, length of residence in a given locality, or political convictions. We advocate recognition of the Russian language as the official language on the territory of the USSR, in light of the conditions that have developed historically and with a view to carrying out unionwide tasks. We are in favor of the creation of all the necessary conditions for the free development of the USSR's peoples regardless of place of residence within the territory of the united federal state, and in favor of concentrating efforts on the acceleration, formulation, and adoption of very important economic and ecological laws of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics. One of our slogans is the supremacy of ecological priorities over economic in the resolution of all national economic tasks. One important point in our program is the further strengthening of such unionwide state structures of power as the USSR Armed Forces and organs of state security, internal affairs, and state customs control of the USSR.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Semenovich, how many members does your deputies' group have today?

[Petrushenko] More than 300. There are representatives of all the union republics. The number of group members is constantly growing.

[Correspondent] What are the immediate tasks of your deputies' group?

[Petrushenko] Immediately after the end of the extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies we will be going to the Baltic region to study the situation there on the ground and if possible influence it with a view to stopping further confrontation.

[Correspondent] Influence it how, by what methods?

[Petrushenko] We only use democratic, parliamentary forms of work. The Soyuz deputies' group needs support. We are counting on the assistance and support of labor and military collectives, veterans of war and labor, internationalist servicemen—all who are concerned about the fate of our federation and all who value our common home—the USSR.

Congress of People's Deputies Concludes Work

LD1503185590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] It has just been reported to us that the congress has finished work. I want to remind you that the central television will report fully of the events which took place at the congress on the second channel.

Political & Social

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Resumes

LD1603075690 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—The plenary session of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee resumed its work at 10.00 [0700 GMT] in the Kremlin today.

Items concerning draft new rules of the CPSU and time limits for a report-and-election campaign within the party are under consideration.

Offical Says Gorbachev Will Rule Democratically

LD1503233190 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2110 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Madrid, March 15 (TANJUG)—"I am convinced that Mikhail Gorbachev will rule the Soviet Union in a democratic way," Vadim Zagladin, the head of the delegation of the Soviet Committee for Peace, told a press conference here today.

Asked if the introduction of the presidential system in the Soviet Union carries the danger of too much power being given to one person, Zagladin, one of Gorbachev's closest aides, said the country now needs an efficient coordinator. The presidential system in the Kremlin carries no more danger of accumulation of personal power than similar systems in the United States or France, he added.

Zagladin also said that perestroyka is entering upon a new stage and that some significant and concrete results—especially as regards more consumer goods on the home market—should be expected already in the second half of this year.

"In the Soviet Union, the new and the old face confront each other. This hampers and destabilizes perestroyka, but things are irrepressibly moving forward"—said Zagladin.

Gerasimov on President Gorbachev's Election

OW1503170890

[Editorial Report] Tokyo NHK General Television Network at 1209 GMT on 15 March in its "NHK News Today" program carries a live interview program on the significance of Mikahil Gorbachev's election as the state president. Participating in the program via satellite relay are: Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, from a Moscow studio; (Dmitri Saimus), senior researcher at

the Carnegie Foundation, from a Washington, D.C., studio; and Hiroshi Kimura, professor at Hokkaido University, from the NHK Tokyo studio. The interview program is moderated by newscaster Jiro Hirano from the NHK Tokyo studio.

After showing videos of Gorbachev's inaugural speech, Hirano asks the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, "What do you think is the most important point in this inaugural speech of the new President Gorbachev?"

Gerasimov, speaking in Russian with simultaneous translation into Japanese, says: "The most important point is the question of how perestroyka will continue to be developed during the next era. The most important questions, which have cropped up, are the economic, financial and ethnic strife issues. The most important of them all is to open up this umbrella of so-called perestroyka and....[changes thought] I would say that what is now under way in Moscow, can be called a revolution. I would call it a lawful revolution. The fact that a presidential system was put into effect in the history of our country is a revolutionary event. I think that this in itself is the most important thing."

After turning to the Washington and the Tokyo studios to hear (Saimus)' and Kimura's comments on how they characterize the Gorbachev speech, the program then shows videos depicting Gorbachev's major activities since coming to power following the death of former CPSU General Secretary Chernenko.

The program then shows recorded interviews with various Soviet citizens on whether they support or oppose Gorbachev assuming the presidency, followed by a recorded interview with Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, who welcomes and congratulates Gorbachev's inauguration.

After a unnamed female Japanese newscaster reports on reactions in Beijing and East European countries to Gorbachev's election, Hirano returns to Gerasimov and asks what he thinks of the cool response from Moscow citizens to Gorbachev's inauguration.

Gerasimov says: "I do not think that they gave a cool response. The woman in Moscow cited a proverb which says that one should not change horses in the middle of a stream. We already have a leader. The citizens highly praised the fact that he—Gorbachev—started perestroyka. However, it is true that there is criticism that perestroyka has not developed as well as they thought it would. However, in the foreign policy area our country has produced remarkable results. Certainly the economic issue has been placed in a tough situation. The people are complaining about it but, I think this is only natural. Thanks to Gorbachev's emergence....[changes thought] This is the final card for resolving the problem. In accordance with this new presidential system, Gorbachev has been assigned the mission of carrying out this perestroyka to its end. Our country can find no other way—never. We do not have even the room to think of other ways. What I want to say is that the people heartily trust him. But because they trust him, there was some criticism when Gorbachev was a little slow or lacking in resolution. Now that he has seized this enormous presidential power in his hand, they will complain to the president with greater expectations. I think this is the present situation."

Hirano then asks Gerasimov, "Will the introduction of the presidential system result in drastic political and social changes in the Soviet Union?"

Gerasimov replies: "The actual power, the power held by the current Party Central Committee Politburo or by other party organizations, will be transferred to ordinary places, ordinary authorities in democratic states. In other words, the power will be transferred to parliament, administrative organizations, and the president or the office of the president. That is all. The transfer of power is now under way. The CPSU has renounced its monopolistic position and will now make efforts to gain greater support among the people. However, the office of the president is to have the greatest power. The power of the state is now being transferred to the parliament and the office of the president."

Hirano then turns to ask (Saimus) in Washington how he interprets the low support—59 percent—that Gorbachev garnered, after which he then asks Gerasimov: "In comparing the Soviet presidential system with those of France and the United States, under the French presidential system, for example, there is a very powerful presidential executive staff; it is the same way with the White House staff in the United States. Will there be such a powerful executive branch—should I call it the core of the administration—under the Soviet presidential system as well?"

Gerasimov replies: "To be sure, there is the White House in the case of the United States. The Kremlin is its counterpart in the Soviet Union. Since we had no presidential system before, I do not know at this moment how newly President Gorbachev will set up an administrative structure around him, or the office of the president. Some hold the view that Gorbachev had greater power when he was elected general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. That is true, but he renounced that power. He gave up that power in the belief that, if he continued to push ahead the country's administration as heretofore, it would have been an impediment to him. This led to his—what shall I call it—dismissal by the CPSU. The power this time is not based on the so-called party or the bureaucratic system; it constitutes the foundation for the possibility of conducting the country's administration with the participation of a greater number of people. However, this has been extensively backed up by law. In other words, Gorbachev put the presidential power into his hand through the democratization of the people or with the people's support. Certainly Gorbachev is being criticized by both the leftist and rightist factions, but that is because he stands at the center. While the people make

complaints, they still pin great hopes on Gorbachev to save the situation during these difficult times. This is the present situation."

Hirano then asks Gerasimov: "Mr. Gerasimov, it is said that one of the factors hampering perestroyka, which is advocated by Mr. Gorbachev—the new Soviet president, is the conservative nature of bureaucracy or the presence of an extremely conservative bureaucratic machine. In what form will this area be reformed in the days ahead?"

Gerasimov answers: "I think that bureaucratism is actually detached from the power after all. Bureaucrats already have no power. This is because the party gave up power. The decisionmaking authority for all concrete problems in the economic or social life will be transferred to parliament or the president. In the case of any country, the party is supposed to play its role as a party, but I believe that matters concerning the country should be resolved through a national consensus."

Hirano then asks similar questions to (Saimus) in Washington and Professor Kimura in Tokyo, before concluding the program at 1239 GMT.

TASS Supplies Lukyanov Biography

LD1503221790 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—Follows the brief biography of Anatoliy Lukyanov, elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Thursday.

Anatoliy Lukyanov was born on May 7, 1930 in Smolensk. In 1953 he graduated from Moscow State University. He is member of the Soviet Communist Party from 1955. He is Doctor of Law, member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Lukyanov started work from 1943 as a worker of a defence factory.

Upon graduating from the university and completing post-graduate studies he worked as senior consultant of the legal commission at the USSR Council of Ministers.

In 1961-1976 he worked as senior consultant of the legal commission at the USSR Council of Ministers.

In 1961-1976 he worked as senior adviser, deputy chief of the Department for Work of the Soviets at the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

From 1976 he was consultant of the Department of Organisational-Party Work at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

In 1977-1983 he was chief of the Secretariat of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

From 1983 he was first deputy chief, and from 1985 chief of the General Department of the Soviet Communist Party.

From January 1987 he was secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and from November 1987 he was concurrently chief of the Department of Administrative Bodies of the Soviet Communist Party Central Commitee. From October 1988 he was first vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

From 1981 he was member of the Central Auditing Commission of the Soviet Communist Party, and from 1986 member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. Lukyanov was delegate to the 26th and 27th Party Congresses and the 19th All-Union Conference of the Soviet Communist Party. In September 1988 he was elected alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo.

Lukyanov is USSR people's deputy, and deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

He has been decorated with the Orders of the October Revolution and the Red Banner of Labour, and with medals.

On May 29, 1989 he was elected first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On March 15, 1990 he was elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the third extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Trade Body Linked With Moscow Criminal Gang

LD1403155890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The capital's militia has neutralized a particularly dangerous group of operators in the shadow economy. Listen to this report from our correspondent, Anatoliy Fedorov which he is broadcasting from the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee.

[Fedorov] [passage omitted describing what has been confiscated from the gang: It includes money, rubles, gold sovereigns from the end of the last century, foreign hard currency including dollars and West German marks. The value of this money has been estimated at 3.5 million rubles. There is also a large number of weapons from ancient daggers and swords to a Kalashnikov. They have been confiscated from various criminal groups] However, let's come back to today's affair and the reason we have been brought here by the leaders of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the City Executive Committee. It began in the summer of last year. It is explained by Petr Stepanovich Bogdanov, deputy USSR minister of internal affairs and head of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee, and Aleksey Prokhorovich Pugayev, his deputy who is in charge of all the Main Directorate's operational services.

[Begin recording] [Bogdanov] On 25 June last year, our comrades managed to arrest a certain cooperative

chairman who was found to have a significant amount of valuables and a considerable sum of money in Soviet and foreign currency and weapons. That was what started the case, a serious one. Our investigations are almost completed and we confiscated from the criminals, who count among their number five heads of five cooperatives—there are leaders of several state organizations as well...[sentence incomplete]

[Pugayev] These valuables have been confiscated from Soviet nouveaux riches, wealthy parvenus, who have done basically nothing for the state or society but who have by means of engaging in basic financial speculation attempted to gain possession of R380 million. True, they were able to take a total of R8 million in cash out of Moscow banks and to spend some of it. All this shows that there are very serious defects in both the Law on Cooperatives and our own instructions on banking operations. The case is coming to an end, the accused are now being made familiar with all the materials of the criminal charges, and the case will soon be sent to the People's Court.

[Bogdanov] This case, in which almost 3.5 million rubles have been confiscated was provided with cover by documents issued by the ANT-3 organisation, that is a branch of ANT. I have to inform you that in Moscow alone there are about 50 branches of ANT. In addition there are around another 30 elsewhere in the country. Eighty branches. It really is an "octopus" that has spread its tentacles all over the country and I was very pleased with yesterday's speech by the Secretary of the Krasnodar Kray Party Committee [polozkov] who, from the rostrum of the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies spoke for all to hear about the illegal activities of ANT and the fact that a whole series of our leaders in the upper echelons are not adopting effective measures. We cannot understand this situation. As you can see, none of our leaders has resigned rather than waiting to be told what to do. We are aware that yet another adventure was in the offing and we have been able to affect that at its very source. The money involved would have been many, many times greater than on this occasion. And it has not happened. [end recording]

Voters Warned of Consequences of 'Apathy'

PM1303122390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Vyacheslav Shchepotkin under the rubric "Political Diary": "Who Are We Helping With Our Indifference?"]

[Text] Today I must publicly say that I made a slight mistake a year ago in one of my political forecasts. It is not very easy to admit this, of course, nor is it very pleasant, because public admission of even the slightest blunder in our society has gradually come to be seen as a virtual encroachment on one's own authority; however, it is time we learned to make our politics moral. My mistake was to predict that the elections following the elections of USSR people's deputies—i.e. to republic-level and local soviets—would be even more intense and the stand taken by citizens even more committed. These elections have now been held in the Soviet Union's three largest republics: the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, and Belorussia. But what, in reality, was the atmosphere in the runup to and during these elections? If it is possible to describe it in one word, the word that seems most suitable is apathetic.

There were bursts of activity on this occasion, of course, but they were precisely that—bursts of activity rather than a mass movement. In Belgorod Oblast, for example, approximately 900,000 of the electorate of almost 1 million went to the polls. The figures for some rural rayons in Gorkiy Oblast, where between 92 and 96 percent of the electorate took part in the vote, showed the level of activity one would have expected in years past.

But, for a start, these "centers of political intensity" could be counted on the fingers of one hand, and, second, I personally do not even feel that they have much credibility. Not only because this time, in addition to everything else, I was able to see the election campaign from the inside, as a candidate for RSFSR people's deputy in Yaroslavskiy National-Territorial Okrug No. 84. It is enough to take a slightly closer look at the above "centers of political intensity" for a great deal to become clear. Take the following detail concerning the Belgorod phenomenon, for example. All the secretaries of the oblast party committee [obkom], the chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom], and also the secretary of the oblispolkom were elected to the oblast soviet here. What does this show? Their triumph in a hard-fought battle, the active stand taken by the electorate? One would like to believe that, but somehow it does not all hang together. All of them, as our own correspondent Vladimir Kulagin confirmed my surmise, got into the soviet through okrugs which offered no alternative candidates.

True, in some regions, voters took a tough civic stand regarding the holders of "one-seat ballot papers," as the orphan candidates were known in Chelyabinsk: They simply struck them off. But the fact that a large number of uncontested candidates became deputies despite this is not an indication of voters' active stand but of their indifference as to who gets elected to organs of power. Their participation in the vote is direct evidence of this. An average of just 76 percent of the electorate voted on this occasion across the RSFSR as a whole. That is the average. In how many okrugs were elections void because more than half of the voters failed to turn up at the polling stations? That is not even the worst of it: In Moscow, which you could call the very heart of political activity, only 64 percent of the electorate turned out to vote!

There are reasons for this apathy, of course. The main reason is the deterioration in our economic life. During the past year—between one election and the next—the

prosperity of a considerable proportion of the nation has not only failed to improve, it has even shown the reverse trend and deteriorated. Because it was drummed into us for so long that we should not rely on ourselves, on our own strengths, reason, and will but on the miracle-working omnipotence of our latest protector, having given our sympathy and our vote to union deputies and failed to receive any miracle in return, many of us now view the elections of republic-level and local deputies as a lost cause. What can they do for us, people say?

The fact that the elections to local soviets and to republic organs of power are once again being lumped together has contributed to the growth in apathy. However, whereas in the past, when every mandate was earmarked for one deputy in particular, this lumping together caused few problems, now, with the abundance of candidates and paucity of information about them, many voters feel confused and, as a consequence, indifferent to the election results. Let others vote if they want to, they say, but I am going to show how I feel by boycotting the elections.

But who are we making things easier for by this kind of action? Ourselves, or those who want to fill the soviets not so much with people fighting for the radical restructuring of society as with uncontested nomenklatura personnel. Just give some thought at least, my indifferent fellow citizens, to the following report from Bashkiria, recently published in IZVESTIYA. As many as 110 of 280 deputies were elected to the autonomous republic's Supreme Soviet at the first attempt. A typical result of the current elections, but that is not the point. The point is this: Who are they, these new parliamentarians? Forty first and two second secretaries of CPSU rayon committees [raykoms] and city committees [gorkoms], 17 chairmen of city and rayon soviet executive committees [gorrayispolkoms], one head of department of the party obkom, one head of department of a rayispolkom, and 41 economic leaders. It is quite possible that many of these people will prove capable of revolutionary changes. But, in that case, why did 16 first secretaries avoid the election struggle and get into the soviets through okrugs offering no alternative candidates? Was this just chance? Perhaps. Only it puts you very much on your guard. So too, incidentally, does the fact that of the 110 newly elected deputies only five are workers, plus two doctors and one teacher. Perhaps we should think seriously about who exactly is not letting workers and peasants into power? The intelligentsia, as some loudly allege, or someone else?

Not only someone else but something else, in fact. I am referring to our indifference as to who holds power in the soviets in the future. Advocates of abrupt changes or people committed to the unhurried renewal of our decrepit system, heralds of revolution by parliamentary methods or bearers of renewed stagnation. We still have a chance to make our choice. There are going to be runoffs in a vast number of okrugs on 18 March and, in some places, repeat elections are even planned. Consequently, when raising our hands in favor of indifferently turning our backs on the forthcoming political action, let us stop and think for a minute: Who are we making things easy for?

Results of Poll on Attitudes to Land Ownership

PM0203095890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Khakhulina report under the rubric "Public Opinion: Poll and Sociologists' Commentaries": "The Owner and the Worker: The Population's Attitude to the Draft Law on Land"]

[Text] Staffers of the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion polled 2,597 people, comprising 1,774 urban and 823 rural inhabitants in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], Belorussia, Moldavia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

Of those who had some degree of knowledge of the draft law, 50-60 percent approve of it in general, although they feel it needs further work. Only 10-12 percent of those polled entirely disapprove of it because of the need for further major work.

Three out of five of those who are familiar with the draft law support the provision on the worker's right to receive a plot of land on leaving a kolkhoz [collective farm] or sovkhoz [state farm]. There is a more reserved attitude to the provision on the right of a collective of workers to receive a plot of land when they leave a kolkhoz or sovkhoz. Some 53 percent of the city dwellers came out in support of this. Among rural dwellers, 42 percent supported this provision, but 33 think it is wrong.

A large proportion of those polled in the city and countryside (85-87 percent) take a positive view of the idea that individual citizens should hold plots of land. Only one in 10 believes that land should not be handed over for individual use at all.

A certain stereotype has formed among the public in both the city and the countryside as to the rights that should be granted to a holder [vladelets] of land. The majority of those polled believe that he should primarily have the right to decide what to produce and in what quantity (this was indicated by 85 percent of city dwellers and 88 percent of country dwellers), to set prices for his produce (64 and 75 percent), and to pass on land by inheritance (58 and 60 percent). As for the right to buy and sell land and hire labor, one-half of those polled take a negative view of this.

As for the ways of transferring land to individual use: They are all equally supported by the rural population—long-term leasing from the state, lifetime holding with the right of inheritance, and private ownership with the right of inheritance and sale (24-26 percent came out in favor of each of these). There are marked variations in preferences in different regions of the country and union republics. For instance, the inhabitants of Latvia are to a greater extent supporters of private ownership of land,

the inhabitants of Central Asia support long-term leasing from the state, and the inhabitants of the RSFSR support lifetime holding of land.

The poll statistics show that among rural inhabitants there is a comparatively widespread readiness to take land in order to conduct individual peasant farming (some 40 percent of those polled expressed this intention). At the same time the actual readiness can be assessed as substantially lower, no more than 10-14 percent of the population. These are those who intend to take land to organize private farming [fermerskoye khozyaystvo] and for whom the only obstacle to this today is the absence of a law on ownership and on land. Potential supporters make up 30-33 percent of the population: those who want to engage in autononous peasant farming, but would first like to see what the conditions will be like. Only one in 10 expressed the firm conviction that he would not want to be a private farmer under any conditions.

The most frequently mentioned factors holding back the readiness to engage in peasant farming are the lack of social and legal protection for autonomous farms. Uncertainty that the state will not ban them again some time and the fear of opposition from kolkhozes when it comes to allocating land and intervention by local or rayon authorities were mentioned by 20-25 percent of those polled.

The most efficient ways of managing the land so as to supply the country with plenty of produce are, in the view of city dwellers, individual farms, as was stated by half of those polled; they came out equally in favor of leased farms (25 percent) and private [fermerskiye] farms (26). Among rural inhabitants there were approximately equal numbers supporting kolkhozes (33 percent) and individual farms (34 percent). Sovkhozes are considered efficient by only one-fifth of those polled in the city and the countryside.

There are marked differences in opinion by regions and republics of the country. Thus the vast majority of inhabitants of Latvia (90 percent) regard individaul farms, mainly of the private farm type, as the most efficient. But eight out of 10 of those polled in Belorussia came out in favor of kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

On the question of how to boost agriculture quickly, there are the most varied opinions. The largest number support the development of agriculture on the basis of a combination of collective and individual forms of farming (46 percent in the city and 34 percent in the countryside).

The study showed a relatively widespread awareness in the mass consciousness of the need for perestroyka in economic relations in agriculture.

Republic Election Day Activity Reported

90UN1109A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Articles covering the elections from various locations by IZVESTIYA correspondents: "Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia Elect Their People's Deputies"]

[Text] **The people of three more republics of our country made their choice on 4 March. It was not an easy choice—in some districts there were 30 to 40 candidates for one deputy's seat. The "toddler age" of our democracy played a bad joke on us: The members of various fronts, platforms and associations demanded to cancel the discriminatory pre-election meetings and after that, in most cases, they failed to agree and to unite around their programs.**

This situation, probably, lowered the public activity in certain locations—in some areas only over 60 percent of the voters showed up at precincts. It might have also enhanced the people's pessimistic attitude as they started to lose their assurance in future changes for the best. Now we can say that the sociologists' forecasts as described in IZVESTIYA 3 days ago (No 62) came true in most cases.

The choice has been made but the struggle is not over yet. According to the data received by the newspaper from various locations, in a number of districts no one candidate will have the necessary majority of votes; there will be runoff elections and new nominations.

The selection that we publish today presents coverage of the elections by our correspondents from different locations.

Moscow

"This time the people came here several minutes before we opened," L. Kovalenkova, chairman of Precinct Electoral Commission No. 51, Oktyabrskiy Rayon Electoral District No. 281 told me. "As we just reported to the district commission, approximately 90 people voted by 9 a.m. That is out of over 2,000 of our constituency which is not too much or too little. The numbers were similar last spring when we were electing the USSR people's deputies. There is still plenty of time till 8 p.m. when we close. We think the people will get more active in the afternoon."

In the morning on 4 March I visited some other precincts. Everywhere the number of those who voted before 9 a.m. was around 100.

This time the Muscovites do not have to deal with separate, departmentalized candidates for the deputies. For the first time in our elections the nominees united into blocs representing people with similar social stands. One of the largest blocs is the "Democratic Russia" with hundreds of candidates from, practically, all of the city's public movements including its many thousand communists. For the first time the election campaign is being

covered not only by the official press, but also the the hundreds of informal publications of today's Moscow.

Early in the election campaign we could observe the polarization of forces and splits between the candidates which prove that the Russian Supreme Soviet will not see the "unanimous opinions" so typical of the old times.

[Correspondent] A. Davydov

Kiev

I do not know whether we are dealing with some specific traits of the candidates' characters or there is some political maneuvering in all of this, but I have to make this fact public. Just before the elections we received information from different parts of the Ukraine that some of the candidates gave up further campaigning and withdrew their nominations. For that reason on the election day we had several areas in the republic where there was only one candidate for one seat. I want to note here that the "blame" for one of such occasions lies on the present Chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium V.S. Shevchenko. As she announced at the last session she was not going to participate any further in the struggle for the seat in the parliament of the republic.

Of course, it is hard to choose the best out of one. But one should feel sorry for those who ran into an entirely opposite difficulty: How do you select the worthiest candidate for one seat in the Supreme Soviet of he republic out of, say, three dozen nominees? I live in the Kiev district that set a record in the pre- election struggle—32 candidates for a seat in the parliament. You might add to this list another six names of the nominees for the seats in the district and city councils and then you will see how difficult it is for a voter to make his choice and how strongly the selection depends on pure chance. Just as some food for thought I want to add that V.A. Ivashko, a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee is running in the district where, on one ballot with him, there are 11 more candidates for the one seat in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

Maybe this was the reason why everybody I asked "Who will win?" refused to answer, even as late as the day before the voting. It is understandable: the miners' strike in Donbass; the maneuver of several USSR people's deputies who, at the last session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, made a show of their refusal to participate in the local parliament elections; all this has complicated the struggle for the seats in the soviets of every level. Today there are mainly the representatives of the three realistic forces of the Ukrainian public and political life that are competing for them. They are informals, party officials, and industrial administrators. Who will the voters prefer?

[Correspondent] S. Tsikora

Minsk

The people of Belorussia are growing more and more politically minded all the time. Last week pre-election meetings took place in various towns where the candidates described their programs and criticized the economical policy of the republic authorities. Same activity, unseen ever before, was evident on the election day too. I am talking to the secretary of the central electoral commission I. Likhach who gets all the reports from the entire republic:

"We had registered 7,190,829 voters by 8 a.m. By noon time half of them have already voted. By 12 o'clock, 199 precincts out of 6,898 completed voting. The constituencies were especially active in Brest and Vitebsk oblasts.

Nothing like this has ever happened in Belorussia before. There were 1,473 candidates to the Supreme Soviet—five nominees for a seat. The voters had a lot of choice, some lists had 15 to 18 names in them. There was less competition for the local councils—two-three people for a seat.

Every day the voters in the republic met with the candidates for deputies. They were listening, arguing, debating. Every evening the candidates spoke from the TV screens about their programs. The pages of the republican, oblast, and rayon newspapers were full of programs and descriptions of the candidates. Unfortunately, not all of them were objective. For instance, the 2 March RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA issue published the article "Victims of Stagnation" and it was reprinted right away by the VECHERNIY MINSK. The article dealt with two candidates for the deputies of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, academicians N. Borisevich and V. Nesterenko. Of course, like all of us they are not perfect but the two newspapers accused them of something that they were not guilty of: supposedly, they did not raise an alarm about the danger of radiation in the republic in 1986. In front of me there is their letter to the Chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers M. Kovalev. In that letter of 24 June 1986 they named almost 50 villages of the Mogilev oblast the people of which should have been immediately evacuated. However, the people are still living there.

[Correspondent] N. Matukovskiy

Leningrad

Pre-election campaigning was going on until late Saturday night. The members of the "People's Front" and "Democratic Elections-90" were doing their work by the subway stations and even in the streets. For many people that was the only thing that helped them to find their way in the huge number of candidates. In the 3,000 Leningrad districts of all types almost 10,000 candidates are running for the seats of people's deputies in the soviets of all levels.

Leningrad anticipated the election day with some concern. The Lensovet [Leningrad city council] passed a

whole number of unpopular decisions just three days before the elections. These decisions—introduction of food ID cards and raising salaries of the top officials—could end in a boycott. The danger of it was quite real and, for that reason, First Secretary of the Leningrad Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee] and Gorkom [city committee] B. Gidaspov appeared on TV and asked the Leningraders to be active and reasonable. It is true: Problems should be solved through participation and not through abstention.

It seemed that the people of Leningrad understand that. The flow of voters to the precincts which I visited has not let up since 9 a.m. One can say for sure: there will be a "quorum" of voters in Leningrad.
[Correspondent] D. Efremov

Khabarovsk

Since early morning I visited 17 electoral precincts of the kray center. Contrary to the official forecast, the voters are quite active. A specific feature of these elections is the lines. The halls where the ballot-boxes are located are just as crowded as the snack-bars next door. (As it is customary on days like this the snack-bars are selling some rarely seen goodies.) People are crowding around the booths.

"Neither city nor district electoral commissions thought about how much time the voters need to make their way through a ballot with some 40 names in it," says the chairman of the precinct electoral commission F. Prosnyak. "We are using now these small premises of a photo studio and previously we used the big "Plamya" club."

Precinct No. 47 of the Industrialniy Rayon of Khabarovsk opened in the small room which usually serves as an outpost for the law enforcing organs. There are only few narrow booths here that are difficult to approach. The voters take their ballots out in the hall or even in the street.

Do they know their candidates? Is their choice a conscious one? To find this out I took some very short interviews.

M. Chupin, retired: "I was a worker myself, so I voted only for workers. I do not know anything about the candidates and I did not go to any meetings with them."

N. Chumarova, a kindergarten cook: "I crossed out every name. I do not believe the candidates' promises, neither do I believe in any changes for the better."

A. Savchenko, a teacher: "I voted for all women candidates. I do not know their programs. I just chose them out of a woman's solidarity."
[Correspondent] B. Reznik

Irkutsk

The first 2 dozen voters came to the precinct in the center of the city where your correspondent voted before it even opened. The same thing happened at some other precincts. Between one-fourth and one-third of the total number of voters have cast their ballots by 10 a.m. in the city and in the oblast. Almost everywhere I heard that the voters are much more active this year than a year ago.

I visited several city districts and talked to dozens of people. My impression was that the people in general understand rather well the positions of the candidates for the deputy seats and they are making quite a deliberate choice. All that is happening in spite of the fact they they are given five ballots each with 20 to 40 names of candidates in them. Obviously, the pre-election campaign was well conducted and not in the "old" meaning of the word. The present struggle has been tough, its leaders really stood out and it was easy for the voters to figure out who was who among the dozens of names.

Experts forecast a voter turnout of not less than 60 percent of the total number. There were a lot fewer people coming to vote after 2 p.m. but public and candidates' representatives were still present at the precincts. They change each other and they intend to be present at the ballot counting. This is another symbol of the people's political activity.
[Correspondent] V. Sbitnev

NEW TIMES Views Press Difficulties

PM0903132090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 9, 27 Feb - 5 Mar 90 pp 24-26

[Unattributed feature: "Power and the Press"]

[Text] Glasnost does not yet mean freedom of the press. Nonetheless, far from everyone welcomes glasnost. Pressmen have spared no effort gaining the right to show the truth, losing in some cases, unfortunately. An analysis of such cases can be instructive.

Stand for your newspaper

Against the background of the recent struggle for the right to show developments in their true light people have perhaps forgotten that the very first effort of this kind, connected with the newspaper Uchitelskaya Gazeta was unsuccessful

UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, one of the best newspapers of the perestroyka period, has been silenced. Maybe subsequent attempts to make newspapers obedient failed because of experience in defeat, gained in connection with that paper.

Since its foundation in 1925, that paper had always been the mouthpiece of the ministries of public education and the trade unions of education workers. It became the exponent of the interests of secondary school teachers only at the end of the eighties, when Vladimir Matveyev came to work in it as editor in chief. Before that it had been one of those papers which people merely skim through, trying in vain to see anything really interesting. Teachers subscribed to it under compulsion. Under

Vladimir Matveyev, the paper changed beyond recognition. He had realized that it was impossible to make the newspaper of interest to everyone, that it should become a newspaper for teachers, discussing on its four pages acute controversial and other problems, with the main emphasis on positive aspects that could unite teachers. The paper got its trend and clear-cut programme, which was carried out in spite of the furious resistance of the seniors, that is, public education officials, and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR. The paper was reproached with its "debunking" authorities. That was not true. The paper helped encourage new authorities, or experts, and new priorities. It popularized new thinking. As a result, secondary school teachers welcomed the newspaper as their own.

The displeased officials found a roundtable way to remove editor Matveyev and change the newspaper's aspect.

In the height of the struggle, Vladimir Matveyev suggested that his paper should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He hoped that it would deliver him from petty departmental tutelage. The enemies of the paper seized the opportunity and succeeded in pushing Matveyev to the background, and placing another person in his office. That happened at the end of 1988, before the experience gained by the staff of the weekly bulletin ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. (In a similar situation, the staff of that bulletin kept publishing articles in support of their editor and thus protected him.) Vladimir Medveyev was deeply hurt, but did not allow his colleagues to write anything about the situation. While reporting on changes in URCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, Moscow papers did not only announce the appointment of a new editor in chief, but also mentioned the fact that Vladimir Matveyev remained in the paper as assistant editor in chief. Such details are usually dispensed with. Vladimir Matveyev was very popular with teachers all over the Soviet Union. So, after that report they stopped worrying and thought that everything was all right.

How much time is needed to kill the spirit of a newspaper? One day, no more. Since the first issue with its new editor in chief, the newspaper has again become one of those to be scanned and thrown away.

Not just one's own business

Within a short period of time the editor-in-chief of Argumentiy i Fakty was now dismissed now offered promotion. The editor has remained in office, though

After a regular conference of editors in chief, held at the Central Committee of the CPSU, it was rumoured in Moscow that Vladislav Starkov, editor in chief of ARGUMENTIY I FAKTY, would be dismissed. That was confirmed at first by foreign radio stations and then by the weekly itself. The reason had been the weekly's publishing the results of the poll concerning the popularity of the most distinguished people on the Soviet political scene. Vadim Medevdev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said that " ...to come to conclusions concerning public opinion only on the basis of letters to a newspaper is tactless and erroneous...."

Vladislav Starkov refused to send in his resignation, however. He was supported by the staff of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, other colleagues, as well as by readers. (By the way, last year the number of subscribers to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY exceeded 20,000,000).

Within several years Vladislav Starkov, formerly not very well known among journalists, had managed to make a paper read practically in every Soviet home. Mass media experts are still to answer the question of what has made this weekly so popular. Perhaps it was the correct understanding of the wish of the reading public to get first-hand information, not to be bored with dull commentaries and moralizing.

Millions of readers regarded the intention to dismiss the editor in chief (whose name they had just learnt) as encroachment upon their rights. As a result, ARGUMENTIY I FAKTY got another 10,000,000 subscribers, in addition to its fabulously large circulation, which has now reached 32,000,000 copies.

During the current election campaign, Vladislav Starkov and six journalists of his staff have been nominated for people's deputies.

Journalists go on strike

The first political strike of Soviet journalists lasted for 47 days. The strikers were the staff of the district newspaper Znamya Kommunizma in the town of Noginsk

On October 25, 1989, the Noginsk CPSU town committee prohibited the publication of a speech by People's Deputy of the USSR Yuriy Afanasyev. He was thus deprived of an opportunity to address his voters. His speech was published, however. For disobedience, V. Puchkov, editor of the newspaper ZNAMYA KOMMUNIZMA, was dismissed from his post at a session of the CPSU town committee's bureau. The newspaper staff went on strike. The CPSU town committee appointed Nikolay Redkin, plumber by training, a new editor of the newspaper.

Many workers' collectives in the town and district supported that strike. The conflict was discussed at the Moscow regional court. Yuriy Afanasyev, Andrey Sakharov, and other people's deputies attended the session. The court found the strike illegal. On December 19, 1989, the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation confirmed the judgement of the Moscow regional court.

The strikers split up. Some of them lost faith in winning a victory. Others set up a cooperative dealing with the publication of guidebooks, collections of poems and reference books. Still others undertook to publish the

newspaper DOVERIYE. The first issue, printed in the city of Kohtla-Jarve, the Estonian SSR, came off the press....

Due to their 47-day strike, the journalists from a modest provincial newspaper have become well known all over the USSR. However, that was also the time of bitter disappointment, because the system of "the Party's guidance over the press" in a small town had managed to punish the journalists who dared to uphold their own positions.

"Without discussing politics"

Knizhnoye Obozreniye has become one of the most popular periodicals. Its publisher is displeased, however

Till quite recently the specialized newspaper KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE was read mostly because of the fact that it printed a list of new books coming off the press. The periodical has changed and got many more readers of late, thanks to its new editor in chief, Yevgeniy Averin. (Yevgeniy is well known in the muscovites as the editor of MOSKOVKSIY KOMSOMOLETS for many years.)

Last summer there was a real fight between the editors of KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE and the board of the State Committee of the USSR for Publishing, Printing and Selling (Goscompechat). The editors of other newspapers and magazines, people's deputies, and the reading public were involved in that fight.

From the viewpoint of the KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE editors, the situation is as follows. Goskompechat wants to dismiss Yevgeniy Averin and appoint another persiion to his post. Moreover, it wants to reduce the paper to its former dull existence, having prohibited it from voicing its opinion on new books, their authors and policy in literature, which is part of general politics.

Goskompechat sees it merely as a structural change. Nikolay Yefimov, the new head of Goskompechat,, who had worked in the London office of the NOVOSTI Press Agency some time ago, said to newsmen that the Goskompechat board had discussed the structure and the idea of that periodical two times. The British edition of the same kind was mentioned as a possible example to follow. It only discusses books, without touching on politics.

What has politics to do with this? It is believed in KNOZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE that the point is this: many authors of high rank, the fabulously large editions of whose books were mentioned by the newspaper, have got angry. The reading public now have learnt the reason for the shortage of paper to be used for the publication of good and interesting books.

Most probably, the publisher is displeased with the fact that the editors of KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIY prefer to think for themselves and to voice their opinions whenever they deem it necessary. The newspaper was the first to demand that Solzhenitsyn's Soviet citizenship be restored. The paper published Sakharov's election programme. It noted that ROMAN-GAZETA printed (in millions of copies) literature fit for pulp when there was the dire shortage of paper. The newspaper also published a letter in support of the magazine OKTYABR, signed by people's deputies of the USSR, writers, scientists, artists, actors and other people working in the field of culture.

It looks like the publisher blames the newspaper for what the reading public approve. The numerous readers of KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE have done everything to protect the newspaper, and have nominated its editor in chief candidate for the election to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR people's deputies, and the Committee on Glasnost under the USSR Supreme Soviet (which might be called journalists' emergency aid as well) have undertaken to analyze the situation.

In the meantime, the editor in chief has remained in his office, and the readers receive the newspaper which they like and to which they subscribed. Its circulation keeps growing. This speaks for itself in our time, when people have ample opportunities for choosing a periodical of interest to them.

The new-born on the verge of death The magzine RODINA (Homeland) appeared for only a year...

Though it is February, the first issue of Rodina has not yet been sent to the press. The work on the second issue has been suspended and the material for the third one has not even been accepted by the PRAVDA press.

RODINA was launched last year under the auspieces of the newspaper PRAVDA. Inaugurated as a national magazine, it has been reduced to the status of a republican periodical in keeping with a decision of higher authorities, RODINA has become a magazine published by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

However, the decision cannot be carried out for practical reasons very common for our state. There are no printing capacities, paper or office premises for the publication of RODINA. The PRAVDA press, the largest in the country, is overloaded with orders and no longer publishes the magazine. The RODINA staff have been ordered to return their passes to the administration and clear out. Pravda is fulfilling the decision of higher authorities.

What is it? Inefficiency? Or is it true, as rumour has it, that the higher authorities are displeased with the magazine?

In any case, it is a matter of complete disregard for the rights of readers and the staff who have been deprived not only of the possibility to work. In fact, their position is now uncertain.

A resurrection that failed

Leningrad writers denied the Leningrad twice

In violation of a decision taken by the Secretariat of the Party's Central Committee, the Leningrad Party leaders have not handed the magazine LENINGRAD over to the writers' organization of that city. The magazine has become famous owing to its tragic history.

In 1946, LENINGRAD and ZVEZDA were closed following a decision adopted on these magazines by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. They were harshly criticized for publishing poems by Anna Akhmatova, stories by Mikhail Zoshchenko and other eminent writers.

The 1946 decision was annulled by the Political Bureau only in 1988. A year later, responding to the Leningrad writers' request, the Secretariat of the Party's Central Committee decided to resume publication of the maazine. But this decision has not been fulfilled.

At a meeting of the board of the Writers' Union of the Russian Federation, a small group (30 of 430 LENINGRAD writers) demanded that the magazine LENINGRAD should be returned to them. The Leningrad regional party committee concluded that the writers of the city did not need a literary magazine, and decided to place it in charge of the regional and city soviets.

Introduction of Multiparty System Discussed

PM2802190090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, 20-26 Feb 90 pp 5-7

[Leonid Ionin article: "On the Eve of Decisive Events"]

[Text] The past plenary meeting has impressed me as controversial. On the one hand, the Party is not as united as its leadership would like it to be. The meeting resembles an assemblage of bus passengers, many of them grumbling about it going in the wrong direction, but none getting off for fear of being left high and dry on the roadside. On the other hand, the plenary meeting has shown that perestroyka is acquiring a logic of its own, in many respects independent of the intentions, wishes and personal inclinations of the leadership.

The developments now in the offing are likely to be much more farther-reaching than the revocation of the notorious Article 6 of the Constitution, the acceptance (theoretical so far) of the possibility of a multiparty system, or a grudging permission - with many reservations - of "private labour property."

The meeting concentrated on the Party's internal affairs and its role in society. The relevant discussions revealed that most Central Committee members were torn between two desires: first, to see the CPSU a democratic party in a democratic society; and second, to prevent it from becoming a "discussion club," to keep its so-called "vanguard role." Lamentably, you can't kill two birds with one stone. The "vanguard role" has been all but lost. As already indicated on more than one occasion, the vanguard of perestroyka comprises only a rather limited group of party leaders, while the central and local party bodies pursue more often than not policy lines of their own, running counter to the objectives of perestroyka proclaimed from above. Such lack of coordination—to the extent of a certain margin of independence of local party bodies from the central authorities—has become possible owing to the actual (even though not yet formalized) democratization of intraparty life. However, the self-same democratization has made possible a "rebellion" of the party grassroots against local executives, which leads to further democratization and, naturally, to the weakening of the command system within the party. At the same time, there form, within the party, groups of general democratic orientation alien to "vanguardism" and aware of the need for an equal participation of non-communist groups in politics. All this adds up to the discussion atmosphere, outside which democratic perestroika is unthinkable. Although it rules out the performance of the "vanguard role" in the old, traditional sense, it is only such an atmosphere that allows the Party to keep certain prestige and to remain one of the leading political forces in the future.

Why "one of...," and what political forces could stand on a par with the Communists in the future? After all, it has all but become a truism that we have no force, apart from the CPSU, capable of carrying perestroika through. This oft-repeated phrase: "there is no other force but..." suggests the follow-up: "nor can there be," accompanied, for good measure, by the banging of the fist on the desk. Actually, such an approach is, first of all, unfair, and, second, dangerous. Unfair, because in a situation where the party had monopoly on power and operated hand in glove with the government, the Army and the KGB, the alternative political forces simply had no chance to express themselves. All sorts of bans, restrictions and sanctions artificially narrowed down the spectrum of political choice. The situation has not undergone cardinal changes until now.

The danger of such an approach lies in that it creates the impression that perestroyka must culminate in something "ultimate and final," which only the CPSU can build, whereupon all the other parties will become altogether superfluous. This is a vicious circle of utopian logic, which traps anyone - whether he wants it or not - who fails to see the real purpose of political perestroyka: to end totalitarian rule, to grant individuals and social groups the right to having different aims and interests, to set up a system guaranteeing an equal representation of these aims and interests in legislation and state administration. In this context, the declaration that there are no alternative political forces is nothing but the self-denial of perestroyka.

Whether such forces exist or not can be shown only by political reality free from artificial barriers and restrictions. There is no forecasting, to a high enough degree of accuracy, the future alignment of forces, although there

is a likelihood of social democratic ideas having considerable influence, of various Christian parties taking shape, and a kind of an "industrial" party being organized on the basis of the Cooperators' Union. Anyway, the current variety of unions and movements indicates that there will be many parties. Just how strong a competition this or that party or a multiparty coalition manages to offer the CPSU in the struggle for political leadership will largely depend on the CPSU itself, on what kind of a new look it will assume within the next few months or years. As it is now, the party is ill-equipped for political struggle, and the elections of the people's deputies of the U.S.S.R. have borne this out. Over the decades of monopoly rule it has degraded from the leader of an extensive popular movement to a bureaucratic party. Its prestige has been severely damaged by—among other things—the numerous "errors" of its leadership, which cost the country and the nation incalculable lives over the same decades. After it is separated from the state and affiliation with it ceases to be a factor in carving out a sucessful career in any sphere of life, its following will dwindle sharply.

Such a gloomy prospect appears to be quite likely. Why, in that case, should the party give up its monopoly on power, some may ask. One can adduce moral and ethical reasons for that: in the absence of nationwide support, claims to ruling all and sundry amount to dictatorship and coercion; a party preaching rule by the people should turn to the people for a confirmation of its right to power. This appears to be a sound idea, even though a bit naive, considering the well-known fact that politics and morality do not always go together.

One can also argue in terms of real politics. Urgent democratic reforms offer the nation and the party the only realistic way out of the crisis. This hasn't been too evident until quite recently. Sporadic and feeble manifestations of social protest did not go beyond the confines of civil initiatives and all sorts of unofficial associations which occasionally broke through bureaucratic barriers. The party leadership called upon individual communists and their organizations to cooperate with these initiatives and associations. This cooperation, it appeared, could be got under way within the framework of the existing setup, because protesters remonstrated about putting into question the legitimacy of the power system as a whole.

However, the deepening of the crisis, on the one hand, and the transformation of public consciousness on the other, gave rise to all manner of mass social movements, ranging from conservative and radical nationalist to radical democratic. First strikes were called, the time of street-meeting democracy set in, and the once amorphous movements promptly began to assume a clear-cut configuration (political rather than social) and to improve their organization. It has turned out that a substantial proportion of these movements does not accept the current power structure - what's more, regards it as an obstacle to the implementation of the "government by the people" ideal. Examples abound: from the national movements in the republics (the Russian Republic included) to radical national fronts which, as their positions crystalize, gravitate towards the programme of the Democratic Union.

We can, of course, argue over "what is behind" these movements and "what they are really after," but one thing is indisputable: these movements are very much a real political force.

At this juncture it has turned out that the political system existing in the country does not have the means for peacefully "discharging" the enormous potential the social movements are charged with. As a matter of fact, they can be discharged peacefully just one way - recognizing the legitimacy of their representation in the political structure.

It is this culmination and this turning point of the progress of perestroyka that the present plenary meeting has coincided with. It is no accident that the meeting occasioned a mass rally (perhaps Moscow's largest over the perestroyka years), that our attention shifted from Moscow to the Transcaucasus and to the Baltic republics, that the meeting proceeded amidst rumours about progroms and the civil war. The very logic of perestroyka has led the party to the need for a decisive political move salutary for itself and for the nation—the recognition of the multiparty system, i.e., paving the way for a peaceful settlement of the now acute contradictions.

The platform of the CPSU Central Committee, drafted for the 28th Party Congress, has come to include the appropriate paragraph, which goes: "The development of society does not rule out the possibility of establishing alternative parties.... The CPSU does not claim monopoly, and is prepared for a politicial dialogue and cooperation with all those coming out for the renovation of socialist society." Obviously, this is the only possible move.

Has it come too late? Besides, the professed acceptance of the multiparty system in a political declaration is a far cry from its emergence. In practice, the introduction of the multiparty system is hardly likely to be a simple matter. An appropriate state and legal mechanism will be required for the purpose. It is necessary to ensure above all that the alternative parties be registered, not merely permitted (as is the case now with all kinds of unofficial associations). Further, it is necessary to carry out a real revolution in the minds of civil servants who have the prerogative of deciding - to the extent of their understanding of Marxism and socialism - which ideology and which programme is "right" and which is "wrong." It is necessary to guarantee freedom of political expression for all, which involves the depoliticization of the state administration, the courts of law and the Army. Naturally, the role and functions of the party committees at enterprises and institutions will come in for discussion.

Vorontsov on Jewish Emigration to Israel

PM2302180090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 18 Feb 90 pp 1, 13

[Aleksandr Makhov interview with First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov; date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction; last paragraph is editors' note: "No More Restrictions"]

[Text] The emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, unrestricted now save for the normative measures to protect national security, has given rise to certain tensions in Soviet-Arab relations. The Middle East is now appealing to the Soviet Government to reintroduce restrictions because the possibility of settling new arrivals from the USSR on the occupied territories might further complicate the creation of an independent Palestinian state. First Deputy Foriegn Minister of the USSR Yuliy Vorontsov discusses the situation with NM commentator Aleksandr Makhov.

Vorontsov: Our position is crystal-clear. It is probable that the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will adopt the Law on Emigration from the Immigration to the USSR which would unambiguously confirm the right of every Soviet citizen, without any exceptions, to leave the country freely. All state bodies in the USSR should abide by this statute whether or not the established order is to everybody's liking.

MN: But it is my impression that in calling upon the USSR to resolve problems by reinstating restrictions the Arab world continues to see this country in the old light....

Vorontsov: Exactly. To this day it has not been fully understood by all that the Soviet Union is no longer what it was a few years ago. Out of habit they still treat us as a totalitarian regime able to resolve poroblems by bans and restrictions. I spoke about this recently to the ambassador of Arab countries stationed in Moscow. Specifically, I asked them if there were legal restrictions on the emigration of their own citizens. It appeared there weren't. Why then should we be denied the right to use internationally accepted norms? I had to explain to the esteemed ambassadors that from now on we are going to act in strict adherence to the law, as all democratic countries do.

MN: Formerly, the majority of Jewish emigrants used to go to the United States, not Israel. Then the USA introduced yearly immigration quotas. Allegations are being made in the Arab world that these were introduced on purpose, to direct a massive flow of new settlers to the occupied Palestinian territories. Do you subscribe to such an opinion?

Vorontsof: We also feel this was one of the reasons for the decision. Indeed, for years and years we have been accused of restricting Jewish emigration. When the restrictions were lifted, the USA imposed narrow limits on immigration. We have repeatedly pointed this out to American officials. I think the problem has to be settled by diplomatic means.

I would also like to mention the Soviet position with regard to Israel. In our opinion they should forbid the settlement of new arrivals on the illegally occupied Arab territories. This is how I see the possible solution. [Vorontsov ends]

Editors' note: We fully subscribe to the view of the Foreign Ministry, but we feel that the solution to this conflict situation may also be sought outside the domain of foreign policy. It is no accident that the exodus of Soviet Jews, which was impressive anyway, has increased markedly in the last few months. Rumours of Jewish pogroms, reinforced by Pamyat's racist activities and the unjustifiable passivity of those responsible for law-enforcement have, as we now see, not only sharpened the situation at home, but also caused international complications for the USSR.

Figures for Crime Against Militia Disclosed

PM1403145190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[A. Illesh report: "How to Protect the Militiaman?"]

[Text] On 13 March the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Press Bureau held a briefing devoted to the legal protection of militia workers. This discussion was prompted by articles in our newspaper—"How They Caught the Murderer" and "Once Again on How They Caught the Murderer" (IZVESTIYA No. 299 for 1989 and No. 67 for this year).

The assembled journalists were told that the USSR MVD fully supports the stand taken in our articles. The ministry too is extremely concerned at the legal position of its employees. As for the specific facts reported in IZVESTIYA, a special commission is now working, and we will familiarize our readers with the results of its activity.

Now about the "fork" in which those who are called upon to protect you and me frequently find themselves—between criminals and their own not always objective leadership.

There has recently been an increase in the frequency of cases of criminal attempts on the life and health of MVD workers, of resistance being offered to them, and of humiliation of their honor and dignity. Particular alarm is aroused by deaths of militiamen, cases of which are growing yearly. According to UNESCO data, the number of policemen who died in the United States and France during 1985-86 was 2.5 times below the number of militia workers who died during the same period in the USSR. In absolute figures the situation looks like this: In 1988 263 militiamen died in the execution of their official duties. In 1989, 345....

It was pointed out at the briefing that a draft law "On Liability for Offenses Against Persons Performing Official Duties or Their Public Duty of Protecting Public Order and Citizens' Rights" has now been drawn up.

But this is one aspect of the matter. The militia, as life shows, frequently incurs "losses" on another "front" too.

Service by privates and command personnel in the militia is governed by a special statute. Once again, the figures: During the past year 83,500 people were discharged from organs, including 37,700 officers (the corresponding figures for 1988 were 77,000 and 32,600). Almost 40 percent were discharged for negative reasons—more than half in the criminal investigation department and the divisional inspectors' service. Observance of legality by the militia itself assumes special significance in an atmosphere of social tension. The number of violations here fell 15.5 percent during the year. Fewer cases of a cover-up of crimes and beatings were recorded. But the situation is extraordinary all the same. A graphic example of this is the sharp growth (12 percent) in the number of crimes committed by militia employees: Murders, for example, increased 140 percent (from 24 to 57). Precisely 132 bribetakers (one-third more than in 1988) were exposed and prosecuted. Of these, 64 were in MVD organs of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, 21 in the Ukraine, 13 in Uzbekistan, and 14 in Kazakhstan. There is information on the corrupt ties of 287 MVD organ workers, including some of quite high rank....

You might think that the huge number of people discharged from the militia can be accounted for by the just desire to get rid of sluggards, louts, and unprofessional workers. But is dismissal always justified? Some 7,000 complaints from persons discharged from the militia's ranks were sent "upstairs" during the year. Following checks, almost 1,000 of them had to be reinstated! Consequently, in some places inconvenient or awkward people or people who know "too much" are being done away with under the banner of the struggle for purity of ranks. It was of this and of the position of cadre workers and supervisory organs that IZVESTIYA spoke in the aforesaid articles.

Economic

State Insurance Body Claims Rival is Illegal

PM1403144390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[S. Kapustin report: "'Risk Money': Returning to a Topic"]

[Text] Moscow—This was the title of an article published in PRAVDA 28 August of last year. It was devoted to the establishment of a new organization which began to conclude contracts for virtually all types of insurance in the world. The "Tsentrreserv" joint stock insurance association intended to fill the gaps in this type of financial activity, which is highly prestigious in the West but not very popular in our country.

Today the "Rospotrebsoyuz Rossiya" joint stock association has taken this rival of the Gosstrakh [Main Administration for State Insurance] under its wing. There can be no question of real rivalry. The scales on which they operate are not comparable, nor do the types of insurance offered coincide.

The association concludes contracts for collective insurance of workers, employees, and children against accidents and death from any cause. In addition, the "Tsentrrezerv," as distinct from the Gosstrakh, also concludes contracts for insurance against economic risks, insurance of freight transportation, the disabled of all groups, and people aged over 65....

This would appear to be a cause for joy. New social protectors have appeared in our country. Additional funds are flowing into the Ministry of Finance. However, the Gosstrakh has decided to combat all forms of competition. And the best method of combatting an enemy is, as is well known, declaring the rival to be "outside the law." This is exactly what was done in the case of the "Tsentrreserv."

A letter signed by V. Shakhov, deputy minister of finance and chairman of the USSR Gosstrakh, was hastily dispatched to all cities and villages and published by many rayon and city newspapers. Its text gave very transparent hints as to whom people should do business with and with whom they should not. According to Comrade Shakhov's claim, any insurance establishments, apart from the one which he is heading, can insure only their own (?!) property.

It is evident from a conclusion reached by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law that "insurance establishments are entitled to insure any property belonging either to private individuals or corporate bodies," and also that there is "no legislation to support the state monopoly on insurance activities.... USSR Ministry of Finance letters on questions of restricting these activities represent an unlawful attempt to preserve the virtual monopoly of the Gosstrakh on insurance activities which has taken shape over decades. In current conditions such attempts are clearly at variance with existing legislation and the general course of the party and the government toward the demonopolization of the economy."

Report on Examination of Cooperative Enterprises

PM1403113190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[V. Romanyuk report under the rubric: "At the USSR Council of Ministers": "Wages That Have Not Been Earned"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has examined the results of a checkup on the activities of

enterprises and cooperatives set up at these enterprises under economic reform conditions.

The first two months of 1990 are an important stage in the implementation of the government program to improve the economy, N.I. Ryzhkov, who opened the session, emphasized. In a number of national economic complexes a certain amount of progress has been achieved, especially in the development of the consumer goods production. It totaled 15 percent in the machine-building complex and 20 percent in the military-industrial complex. However, judging by the empty shelves in stores, a balance has still not been achieved in the consumer market. For the same old reason: The population's money incomes are growing faster than the supply of consumer goods.

Last year saw a record increase in the population's incomes—64 billion rubles (R) (12.9 percent). This is just slighly less than the increase for the entire 11th Five-Year Plan (R78 billion). This year the tax regulating wage fund increases, which has been criticized from the highest rostrums on many occasions as too rigorous and as resulting virtually in the imposition of a freeze on working people's wages, has come into force,. And what is the upshot? During the first two months of 1990 the increase in the population's incomes has hit another record—14.8 percent.

What kind of a phenomenon is this? The increase in wages would not be alarming as such, if only production increased at the same pace. However, during the past year the increase in production totaled only 1.7 percent (in 1988 it was 3.9 percent). The beginning of 1990 did not bring the radical breakthrough which we need so badly. Now a commission, set up specially, has carried out a check at 200 enterprises and a large number of cooperatives created at those enterprises and established numerous violations of existing legislation.

Let us begin with the fact that the main source of the population's incomes are wages. The switch of enterprises and organizations to new pay terms has resulted in increased wages and salaries, but by no means in increased production. In the metallurgical complex, for instance, the production volume did not increase at all last year, and in the fuel and energy complex it even went down, yet the wage funds in these sectors increased by 8.3 and 7.6 percent respectively.

The survey revealed a broad range of methods and tricks to which economic managers are resorting for the sole purpose of maintaining the trend toward paying out higher wages, irrespective of the circumstances—wages which, as a rule, have not been earned. I will cite a few of them. A traditional method is to increase the proportion of the goods marked "N" (new) or "D" (deficit). At the capital's "Bolshevichka" factory which produces men's clothing the share of these goods exceeds four-fifths of the total volume of output. However, take an objective indicator—the normative processing cost—and you will see that it increased by only 3.7 percent in 1989, while payments from the wages fund increased by 9.2 percent. At the Monino worsted combine payments into the material incentives fund based on markups to prices for goods with the "N" index increased by R2.6 million or 50 percent. However, the supply of goods did not increase at all!

And here is a relatively new method. It is connected with the activity of cooperatives set up at the enterprises. The relevant government resolution laid down that if a production facility, or responsibility for the production of a certain quantity of goods, is handed over to a cooperative, the enterprise wage fund must be reduced accordingly. How could it be otherwise. After all, this work is now being carried out by others, and they are earning quite well, moreover. However, it appears that a different logic is sometimes applied. At a whole series of enterprises the money in question has been retained in the enterprise wage fund. Here is an example. At the Oskolskiy electrometallurgical combine a cooperative was set up, based on the liming shop. The cooperative operates independently, but the electrometallurgists continue to pay themselves R1.4 million for the work now being done by others. And this is no isolated case. In the national economy as a whol uch overpayments total R5 billion, minus some R38 million by which the wage fund at some enterprises has actually been adjusted. The procedure laid down by the government is not being followed, it is being ignored.

Another relatively new method is to extort a one-shot financial subsidy from the ministry and then to include this sum (for life) in the enterprise's base fund. This is a very simple task for banking and financial organs to handle, but they appear by no means always able to cope with it. And here is a method which is as old as Methuselah: It consists in postponing part of the plan targets to the end of the year, in order to be able to draw bonuses throughout the year. A failure at the end of the year does not alter the picture of general financial well-being. At the Bratsk Aluminum Plant, for instance, bonuses were paid out during the first 11 months of last year, and in the end it emerged that they had not been deserved. The annual plan was fullfilled only 94.4 percent.

During the check carried out at the enterprises, instances of overt, unconcealed violations of the procedure for establishing and boosting the wage fund were discovered. The Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building's plant Yanvarskogo Vosstaniya in Odessa artificially boosted its main wage fund by R400,000. Money from the material incentives fund earmarked for the introduction of new pay terms was switched to the wage fund. And the ministry tossed in another R600,000. As a result around R1 million (or eight percent of the total volume of expenditure) was overspent on wages at the enterprise. Despite all this, the association's economic services concocted a wage fund "saving" in excess of half a million rubles—to be included in the enterprise's base wage fund for 1990 (in accordance with a method with which we are familiar).

And finally, a widespread practice is the squandering of social development fund money to pay out all kinds of material benefits. At first glance various payments such as vacation subsidies (up to two-thirds of the wage rate), and additional payments to old-age pensioners on low incomes and nonworking mothers looking after young children look laudable. However, all these payments, which as a rule are not backed by goods, only serve to further exacerbate the general imbalance between supply and demand. In this context criticism was leveled at the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR State Bank for allowing payments to get out of control.

The check revealed instances of blatant, ugly greed. For instance, a group of leading workers at the GPZ-21 [state ball-bearing plant], acting in violation of the procedure laid down by the USSR Supreme Soviet, established a cooperative at the plant to carry out their orders in return for purely symbolic payments for the use of equipment. The cooperative employed only one worker and he was the son of S. Mitichkin, the director. In this way the enterprise management secured an additional source of income which exceeded their wages from their main job two- to three-fold: to which 200 of the enterprise's employees reacted with an angry letter to the government.

Despite sensational exposures, workers in the sphere of science continue to make phenomenal profits. On this occasion it was the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Organization, Management, and Economy of the Petroleum and Gas Industry which caused a stir. The Institute's specialists used their high qualifications to find loopholes in legislation, although in accordance with their calling and sense of duty they should have acted to the contrary. During the first 10 months of 1989 alone, Institute Director A. Tishchenko managed to "earn" 38 salaries, V. Blinov, a leading scientific staffer who is also secretary of the party organization, managed to pocket 39 salaries, while P. Sapozhnikov, head of a laboratory and most resourceful of all, made 83 salaries. They did this by brisk trade in developments carried out earlier. The same P. Sapozhnikov concluded six contracts for the sale of the same publication of methodological guidelines and alternative methods of calculating the efficiency of joint enterprises. In 10 months the laboratory head personally "earned" R41,581, while the director "managed" R20,798.

But this is what has emerged. Although from a moral standpoint the institute's actions are reprehensible, they do not break the law. The same applies to a number of other cases. It is not even very easy to sack the director—he has the backing of the labor collective council. This is evidence of group egoism, and there is as yet no mechanism to combat this evil.

If you analyze the economic aspects of the scientific sector of the entire fuel and energy complex, you will be struck by the fact that the lion's share of income is spent quite blatantly on staff pay: 85 percent in the case of the Institute of Organization, Management, and Economy of the Petroleum and Gas Industry; 69 percent at the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Electrical Power Engineering; and 82 percent in the case of the Middle-Volga geological prospecting expedition.

Another source of unjustified pay fund increases in the sphere of science are excessive prices (this is in addition to the selling of the same piece of work many times over to obtain several payments). At the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification there is the "Energoremont" science-and-production association and within it a modest central design bureau. Last year the volume of scientific and technical output increased by over 50 percent there and profit increased 2.2-fold. Let us not discuss the quality of the development work or the methods of boosting profits here. Let us just focus on one thing: In the course of the year pay increased 4.2-fold!

I was amazed at the composure with which Institute Director A. Tishchenko was parrying all the attacks of his highly-placed opponents. Then the minister made a statement from which it transpired that the question of relieving the director of his duties would be raised, but that it would be very difficult to actually implement it. One member of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium even proposed the following solution: If it is impossible to establish order at the Institute, it should be possible to simply close it down.

It is possible, and in this particular case this is what should be done. However, it is much more important to block all the channels along which wages continue to be squandered. Sometimes this happens with the best possible intentions, it would appear. For instance, the "Yugtransstroy" trust has actively taken up subsidiary farming and is carrying out all kinds of repair work. Imperceptibly, the share of general construction and installation work—the purpose for which the trust was set up—has decreased to 61 percent. Yet wages are paid out in full as before.

I was told by former minister V. Lukyanenko that a director of a sector institute confessed to him in private: "Vladimir Matveyevich, if an opportunity to earn a large sum of money like this crops up, it is a sin to let it slip." So much for moral values. However, the orgy with inflated wages not only kills off the balanced market since any money—earned or unearned—is chasing goods while, as payments increase, levies into the budget naturally decrease and profits become fictitious, thus distorting the whole economic situation in the country.

How are prohibitory mechanisms to prevent excessive payments being made out of wage funds? N. Olshanskiy, director general of the "Agrokhim" association, caused a stir in the hall when he declared that the labor collective council had set the payments ceiling... at 25 salaries per year. The speaker was not in a joking mood, however. He recalled a package of proposals to improve the economic mechanism which he had submitted and which had been passed on to the government at the time and duly

ignored. Meanwhile, it had incorporated a sensible mechanism to regulate wages and to monitor contract prices.

Not everything in these proposals may have been radical. However, today we have to acknowledge that several acute questions have been left hanging in the air, as it were. It is not clear why clients are willing to part so easily with their money in exchange for scientific developments—and, what is more, developments of a dubious quality. How can cooperative members' earnings be monitored? Under existing legislation this is difficult. Meanwhile, cooperatives, copying large-scale industry, are converting considerable assets into cash.

In any case, the premise cited at the beginning of the session claiming that the measures adopted by the government are faultless and that all that is needed is their strict implementation was not entirely vindicated. It is true that in a number of cases group egoism is gaining the upper hand over morality and is infringing existing regulations with relative ease. However, endlessly appealing to mature people's conscience and consciousness stands to achieve little. The government must make sure that its decisions are abided by. Even if, to establish order and social justice, not entirely democratic measures have to be used.

No Radical Change in Industrial Statistics

PM1303144390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[V. Romanyuk report under the "Statistics and Our Commentary" rubric: "February's Figures"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics has just received cable reports from oblasts and republics which indicate that there has still been no radical change in the sphere of industry. A month ago we reported that January saw a one-percent reduction in production volumes in comparison with the first month of 1989. The results of the first two months have not changed the overall situation: There is still a lag of one percent. Contract commitments were 98.2 percent fulfilled for the period January-February (in February there was a shortfall of output worth 0.9 billion rubles [R], while, based on the results of the first two months, the figure was R2.2 billion). One in six enterprises failed to meet its contract commitments. The situation in light industry and the chemical-timber complex, where contract commitments were 97.2 percent and 97 percent fulfilled respectively, was worse than elsewhere.

V. Tolkushkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics], noted in a conversation with me that the negative factors which also frustrated the January program were still at work in February. These include above all interethnic conflicts in the Transcaucasus. According to preliminary estimates, more than 9 million man-days of working time were lost in January-February (against 7 million man-days for the whole of last year, which cannot be described as calm either). In Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia production dropped in the first two months of this year by 40 percent, 16 percent, and 8.8 percent respectively. This is further evidence that each republic's economy is linked to the national economic complex as a whole and especially to neighboring republics. Stoppages at individual production units affect the economy of hundreds of the country's enterprises. For instance, the situation at Yerevan's "Nairit" Science-and-Production Association, along with the incomplete use of the capacities of Sumgait's "Khimprom" and "Orgsintez" associations, is throwing many production units in the chemical industry into ferment as they are suffering a shortage of caustic soda and other components.

The significant drop in production in the defense complex—nonmilitary output is slowly compensating for this—also made an impact on the overall results of the first two months. Admittedly the increase in the production of equipment for light industry and agro-industrial complex processing enterprises—mainly owing to defense sectors—can be regarded as a positive trend.

We have already pointed to the poor work of the chemical-timber complex. This is linked to a considerable degree with the population's struggle for environmental cleanliness. The mass closure of environmentally hazardous production units immediately led to unfavorable consequences; it is affecting production of medicines and a number of biological preparations.

The work of transport somewhat improved in February. In comparison with January, average daily loading and dispatch of goods increased by 4.5 percent. However, shipments still dropped by 3.1 percent in the first two months this year in comparison with the period January-February last year. Approximately 180 million tonnes of economic freight accumulated at loading points—17 days work for the Ministry of Railways! Targets were not met for 10 out of 14 types of freight for which a state transportation order had been issued.

After last year's social conflicts the miners got down to work. However, transportation is proceeding slowly, and coal stocks at mines and pits are more than double the normatives.

The old ailment has been noted in a number of sectors: Despite fulfilling overall volumes, there are failures to meet the targets for products in short supply. In particular, metal workers have failed to produce enough high-durability piping for drilling and pumping operations. Admittedly they failed to receive 177,000 tonnes of coking coal since the beginning of the year, along with 900,000 tonnes of ferrous scrap metal, and are operating at the limit of their resources. However, it is not only transport workers but also scrap metal suppliers that are to blame.

The construction industry operated quite stably in the period January-February: Deliveries of cement, particle board, and a number of other construction materials

have increased. Without doubt, this must make a positive impact on the resolution of housing and other social problems. Enterprises within the machine-building complex have somewhat improved their work. In particular, the delivery of manufacturing centers, forging and pressing equipment with digital program control, and a number of other machines to various sectors of the national economy has increased.

In our last review we noted positive trends in consumer goods production. According to the results of the first two months this year the increase in the main groups totaled five-six percent on the January-February 1989 level. The total increase, according to current estimates, was somewhere around R4 billion. However, it was mainly achieved through cultural and welfare articles. Production of tape recorders increased by 16 percent, washing machines by 14 percent, color televisions, radio receivers, photographic apparatus, and sewing machines by 13 percent, and bicycles by eight percent. There were also increases for goods in daily demand of 37 percent for women's panty hose, 11 percent for household and toilet soap, eight percent for school primers, 11 percent for electric irons, and eight percent for electric kettles.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of light industry goods. There was no increase in fabrics, knitted goods, or footwear. Moreover, there was a shortfall of 35.8 million meters of various fabrics, 5.5 million pairs of hosiery goods, and 2.6 million pairs of footwear, including 600,000 pairs of children's footwear, in the period January-February in comparison with enterprises' plans.

In principle February failed to bring about the longed-for change in industrial production. This compels us to take a sober look at the prospects for completing the first quarter of 1990—the first year in the implementation of the government program for our economic recovery. The program makes a great many promises but still has little to show for it. We will not analyze the situation in every sector. Take the highly important set of goods on which the USSR State Committee for Statistics reports periodically, that is every month. Production dropped for 17 out of 27 types of machine-building output, including reductions of eight percent, 14 percent, and 21 percent for AC electric motors, mainline diesel locomotives, and electric locomotives.

As we can see, the inertia of warm-ups and malfunctions which marked the first weeks of the year has still not been overcome. However, the first quarter of the year is coming to an end. We must not forget that there are only 21 working days in March 1990 (a day less than in March 1989). Thus there is no more time left for warming up.

Exhibition Promotes Aircraft Engine Exports

PM1403155990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[S. Leskov article: "Nothing To Be Gained From Hiding Engines"]

[Text] An exhibition called "Aero Engine Building-90" has opened at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. For the first time it pursues much broader and more complex aims than the traditional report on achievements and familiarization with the sector's prospects. Representatives of 45 of the world's largest aircraft and motor concerns with whom it is proposed to conclude commercial contracts have been invited to the exhibition.

Conversion is a term which has painted the life of our defense sectors in new hues, which have still not been very well assimilated. Modern equipment can and must be used for the production of consumer goods, but a lot of time is wasted on this reorientation even in the most propitious circumstances. In addition, according to world figures, every hour of production in engine building costs $250 per worker, and so the profit from output must be correspondingly high. The second way is to sell our equipment, in this case aero engines, abroad. Admittedly, previously we have not engaged in commerce, but now restrictions on the sale of output by the sector's enterprises have been lifted—it is time to learn to sell.

And what about competition? Of course, it would be naive to think that competitors in the world market are waiting for us with open arms. But besides the USSR, the production of aero engines has been developed in only three countries—the United States, Britain, and France. The reputation of our engines (look no further than the famous engine for the MIG-29!) is very high throughout the world, and the shortage of good engines is most acute. So hopes for extensive exports are very realistic.

Can we make much out of the sale of engines? Here are some very rough estimates. As V. Boguslayev, general director of the Zaporozhye "Motorostroyitel" Production Association, said, the foreign trade price of the D-18T engines with which the "Ruslan" and "Mriya" aircraft purchased by many countries are equipped is about $5 million. Twenty of these engines make about $100 million for which consumer goods worth 1 billion rubles [R] can be purchased. But economists claim that in order to satisfy the internal market we need to supply R10 billion of goods. Zaporozhye's engine manufacturers, incidentally, have already learned the benefit of commercial operations and it is no accident that their exhibit is one of the biggest.

"At this exhibition you will never see 'ministry,' a word which irritates many people," V. Chuyko, chairman of the organizing committee and deputy minister of the aviation industry, said. "The sector enterprises have been given free rein. Apart from the sale of engines, we hope to interest our partners in equipment for the power industry and gas pumping based on aero engines (this ranges from fire extinguishers and snow clearers to mobile generators), new materials, technology, and goods for the consumer market and health care. Because enterprises have little experience in this area, there is a

commercial center at the exhibition to which the most experienced lawyers and economists have been invited."

Scientific

Review of Fifth Space Expedition To Mir

LD1503191790 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—The fifth space expedition to the Soviet orbital station Mir was economically profitable, Yuriy Semenov, general designer of the scientific-production association Energia told a news conference held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press centre today.

The news conference was devoted to the results of the 166-day flight of Soviet cosmonauts Aleksander Viktorenko and Aleksander Serebrov.

Semenov said that the Soviet Union was planning to expand the station's scientific research capabilities over the next few years. One more technological moldule "Kristall" is to be launched to the Mir station on April 9. Semyonov called the new module a microplant that will manufacture crystals in outer space.

Semenov also said that the Soviet Union was planning to put an ecological complex into orbit next year. The ecological complex will help resolve the global planetary task of human survival. The complex will consist of two monitoring modules: "Spektr" and "Priroda."

Semenov also spoke about the Energiya-Buran universal booster transport system. He emphasised that this system was to open new space horizons in the future. It will be indispensable to the development of universal and large-size orbital complex in future. The technical abilities of this system will be tested during Buran's experimental flight in 1991. Buran is to dock with the station, put a payload into orbit and return it to earth.

The fifth space expedition to the Mir station was a turning point in the transition of the Soviet space industry to work in new economic conditions. The mission of Anatoliy Solovyov and Aleksander Balandin, who are now working on the Mir station, will also bring a tangible profit.

Laverov Outlines Reformed Science Policy

PM1403154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Academician N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, by IZVESTIYA scientific observer B. Konovalov; date, place not specified: "Time for Change"]

[Text] [Konovalov] Nikolay Pavlovich, the reform of our science and technology has now begun. In your view, what main directions will the changes take?

[Laverov] It is obvious to everyone now that the "command style" in science does nothing but harm. Therefore the main thrust of scientific and technical policy must be democratization. In our country's scientific and technical complex, which employs 4.2 million people, there are 5,100 functioning institutions—a very complex system. It is clear that it can only develop successfully in conditions of self-regulation and self-management. State influence will remain, of course, but it must take the form of regulation, identification of major priorities.

In my view, basic science should be run by the scientific community, which will independently allocate budget appropriations. It is dangerous here to call any area a secondary one, therefore state support should be provided along the entire front of basic research. One need only boost this support in areas where successes are taking shape that could result in revolutionary breakthroughs in techniques and technology.

Unfortunately, basic research, which has always been the pride and joy of Soviet science, has been experiencing serious problems and has been lagging behind in recent years. Basic research now constitutes less than seven percent of the activity of our scientific and technical complex. In the United States it is 12 percent. Therefore more than 500 million rubles [R] were allocated in 1989 to strengthen the material and technical base of academic science. There is a similar "extra" amount in 1990. This makes around R1 billion extra over two years, and society is entitled to expect some positive improvements.

The second area is applied research and development, which are vitally important in terms of reconstructing and retooling production facilities. They account for one-half of all our expenditure on scientific research and planning and design work. It is intended that this work should be carried out, as a rule, on an economically accountable basis, in accordance with contracts with specific customers.

The third area is major intersectoral scientific and technical programs of statewide significance, including defense, social, and ecological programs. They account for around 40 percent of total expenditure on scientific research and planning and design work. Of course, this work must be centrally managed, on a planned basis, via state orders and state budget finance, with comprehensive assistance from the state.

At the moment very poor use is being made of the higher educational establishment sector of science, although it employs more than one-third of the country's scientific personnel and one-half of all doctors and candidates of sciences. A closer link is needed between higher education and academic science, a formal association even.

Science's material and technical base requires thorough modernization. After 10 years of stagnation, appropriations for its development began to increase in 1988. In particular, capital investments in the construction of scientific and experimental facilities rose from R3.5 billion to R5 billion in 1990. Only 36 percent of scientific organizations have experimental facilities. Industry gets over twice as much money as our science, whereas in industrially developed countries the opposite is true. Expenditure on instruments per scientist is three-four times higher in the United States than in the USSR.

At the recent all-union scientific and practical conference which examined the new philosophy for improving the management of scientific and technical progress, it was stressed that the reform must be based on laws. Unfortunately, we basically lack scientific and technical legislation. This is an abnormal situation. In order to rectify it, we at the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology have set up a special department, headed by Professor A.B. Vengerov, a well known legal expert. In conjunction with the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the scientific community, it will rapidly prepare laws regulating all the activities of the scientific and technical complex.

What the country needs above all, in the opinion of the majority of scientists, is the establishment of an effective mechanism for attuning our economy to scientific and technical progress. It must be plainly stated that unless such a mechanism is created, the ultimate goals of perestroyka will not be attained.

[Konovalov] Evidently, targeted programs at all levels—from unionwide to enterprise—will remain the basic method of solving problems of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. This method did not work before, because those in charge of even the most important state program had only duties, and no rights. Will the situation change at long last? Or will we merely have 15 priority programs instead of 170? And after a while will we again be lamenting the fact that the targeted program method does not work in our conditions....

[Laverov] I want to stress that the 15 current priority programs do not attempt to cover the whole range of research—they are simply the principal areas whose success would cause a chain reaction of achievements. We are trying to manage them in accordance with general world principles. Whereas previously the money for the fulfillment of targets was allocated to ministries, now it goes to the State Committee for Science and Technology. All programs are carried out on the basis of competing projects. Program leaders, in conjunction with their councils drawn from the scientific community, select the most valuable and promising proposals. For example, 1,800 projects were examined for the "New Materials" program and only 130 were selected. The money is not transferred from the State Committee's account to the institution or design bureau, as in the past, but to the actual people in charge of the winning project. The most important stages of the implementation of state programs are incorporated in state orders and must be provided with material and technical resources on a priority basis. The State Committee has currency to acquire licenses and modern instruments and equipment. We are also using this "lever" to support priority programs. Finally, following the experience in the defense complex, we try to identify customers for programs and projects, which makes monitoring considerably more effective.

In order to be able to make valid, well thought-out decisions when deciding on priorities, it is necessary to expand glasnost and strengthen the role of expert appraisals of the topics of research and projects. Expert appraisals are a key element of the system of further democratization of the management of science. The USSR Committee of Public Appraisal also has an important part to play.

[Konovalov] Smart taxation has an enormous part to play. There is a myth going around that all modern solid-state electronics owe their existence to the fact that once, in the United States, all radio equipment was taxed on the basis of the total number of vacuum tubes in the products. This led in the first place to miniaturization, and then to the disappearance of the tubes altogether. What part does the lever of taxation have to play in the reform?

[Laverov] I am convinced that a well thought-out taxation system is the most powerful lever for accelerating scientific and technical progress. The whole world has placed its production on a progressive footing, using various kind of powerful "inertia taxes." For example, the Japanese, through tax pressure, have switched their industry to our "dry cement" technique and metallurgy to our continuous casting of steel. After all, continuous casting saves up to 20 percent of energy resources and 10-15 percent of the metal. Are we not aware of this? We are, but as yet there are no concessions for the development of energy- and resource-saving techniques and no taxes on waste. The State Committee is working on various proposals on taxation and concessionary bank credit.

[Konovalov] There is a fashionable formula: "If you have nothing to give, then give us freedom." To what extent is the State Committee prepared to allow scientific and technical free enterprise? Are you prepared to allow collectives to buy their own institutes and laboratories from the state?

[Laverov] Yes, we intend to do all we can to expand scientific and technical enterprise. There are no obstacles either to entry into the world market or to the switch to a joint-stock form of ownership of institutes and design bureaus.

One knows from world practice that the most dynamically innovative activity takes place at small enterprises and in small organizations, which react quickly to innovations, requiring no major investments and possessing

a flexible structure. This is evidenced by our own practice. At the moment we have around 500 youth scientific-technical creativity centers carrying out work worth more than R1 billion. The research and studies they carry out are implemented between two and three times as quickly and at less expense. Some 8,900 scientific and technical cooperatives have been set up, carrying out work worth around R1.9 billion. It cannot be said that the development of these forms is a painless process. There have been many financial misdemeanors, difficulties, and problems. But by and large it is a very promising area.

[Konovalov] The idea of creating an authoritative Council for Science and Technology under the country's president is popular at the moment. If you were an adviser what would you bring to the attention of the head of our state?

[Laverov] The way science is underestimated in our society. We say a great deal about its important role, but we do little to actually exploit its potential. Second, scientists must become more involved in forecasting the consequences of decisions. Finally, we must ensure that voluntarist approaches are replaced by scientifically valid ones.

I share the fears that, given the way science is underestimated at the moment, a "brain drain" will soon become a very painful reality, with people leaving the country. In this connection special attention should be paid to creating the requisite working conditions for young scientists. It is very important, of course, also to create decent living conditions for them as well.

Deputy Minister on Aircraft Engine Sales

LD1403111390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A report by Petr Orlov from VDNKH [Economic Achievements Exhibition] of the USSR where the first exhibition of aircraft engines in history has opened.

[Begin recording] [Orlov] The designers of Soviet aircraft engines have, so it has turned out, two grudges. Firstly, in the well-known phrase, if a beautiful machine flies well, no mention is made of them. And secondly, even engines no longer produced still remain under a thick covering of secrecy; not to mention the most up-to-date, such as the engine for the SU-27, for which the turbine blades are developed from monocrystals; or the engine for supersonic flights in the stratosphere. For thousands of people, this exhibition is equivalent to public recognition of their work. We have been uncovered, people in design bureaus and scientific and production associations are saying, as though, until now, they have been living and working on an uninhabited island. Yes, they have been uncovered. But what now?

Our country is one of four in the world which can make any aircraft engine. But do we feel confident in this market?

[V.M.Chuyko, deputy minister of the Aviation Industry] That is a difficult question because as far as passenger airplanes are concerned, our market was opened up quite a long time ago now. As for military aircraft and engines, of course, the market, especially for new planes, was closed. Therefore, today, we must, of course, in conjunction with the Defense Ministry and with the government, resolve the matter of the possibility of selling without detriment to the interests of our defense, and of organizing this kind of sale.

[Orlov] Strictly speaking, who ever doubted that our designers can create good, advanced engines? In all probability no one ever had such doubts. As for coffee-grinders, well, yes, this is a big problem. But, it turns out that it too can be solved. Apart from coffee-grinders and saucepans, the Ministry of the Aviation Industry also produces leather-processing and pasta-production lines and many other items of equipment which are, of course, needed, including these machines for farmers, expending both the efforts and intellect of its industry on this.

[Chuyko] An engine for a tactical fighter plane of the previous generation costs $1,700,000.

[Orlov] Would it not be more profitable to use this money to purchase consumer goods from others who have long been able to make them better than you, than to manufacture them yourselves.

[Chuyko] We have no doubts here that it is profitable to do precisely what we are doing, that is, to sell aircraft engines and to procure goods in exchange.

[Orlov] Meanwhile, at this exhibition, next to the Ministry's latest developments, I discovered this result of conversion. The production plan is 180,000 items. [end recording]

[Video shows general views of exhibition, various signs below engines, large rotating turbine, diagrams, people chatting beside exhibits, interview with Chuyko, and examples of consumer goods on display.]

Academician Describes Tokamak-15 Fusion Device

PM1403213090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with Academician B. Kadomtsev by A. Pokrovskiy; date and place of interview not stated: under the rubric "A Glance Into the Future": "A 21st Century Machine"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Academician B. Kadomtsev talks about the new "Tokamak-15" thermonuclear installation which has been commissioned at the I.V. Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute.

[Pokrovskiy] Boris Borisovich, judging simply by ordinal numbers, one might assume that a whole family of "Tokamaks" is operating in our country.

[Kadomtsev] The ordinal number indicates rather our path toward mastering controlled thermonuclear fusion. The solution of this most difficult and immense problem would remove forever mankind's worry about having essential reserves of energy.

I will also say that whereas the West initially treated the Soviet "Tokamak" program with a certain degree of mistrust, increasingly large installations of this type are now being built in the United States, Europe, and Japan.

[Pokrovskiy] What are the main parameters of the "Tokamak-15"?

[Kadomtsev] Firstly I will emphasize that it is not a reactor yet, but an experimental installation in which real fuel is not used. It will allow a large volume of high-temperature plasma to be obtained. Compare—in an earlier large installation, the "Tokamak-10," the plasma volume was around four cubic meters, but in the "Tokamak-15" the volume is 23 cubic meters. Plasma obtained in such volumes is purer, since it is further from the walls. According to calculations it can be heated to 100 million degrees. The magnetic field here is maintained by superconducting coils of a tin-niobium alloy. They have not yet been used on such a scale abroad.

We have already cooled the installation to approximately 10 degrees Kelvin and obtained a magnetic field on the order of 35 kilooersteds and a current of 700,000 amperes—also something of a record for our country. We are very pleased to have successfully mastered this complex structure consisting of a multitude of systems—cryogenic, vacuum, control, etc. We expect to begin scheduled physical experiments by fall.

[Pokrovskiy] And what then?

[Kadomtsev] Then I would like to mention the international "ITER" (International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor) project, which our country initiated. As you can see, here we are talking about a reactor, that is, about a large-capacity thermonuclear energy source. The design work on this is being conducted by a group of scientists from various countries under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency at the Institute of Plasma Physics near Munich. And so our "Tokamak-15" is a part of the research work toward the building of this reactor.

[Pokrovskiy) What are the predictions here?

[Kadomtsev] According to the preliminary plans, the formulation of a technical design and the construction of the reactor will begin in 1991-95. And in the next century—as early as 2003 according to schedule—it could begin operation.

Official Denies Rovno Nuclear Station Leak

PM1203143790 Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 4

[Interview with V. Korovkin, director of Rovno AES, by G. Klyucherov in Kuznetsovsk under the "Mini-interview" rubric; date of interview not stated: "Rumors Not Confirmed"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Rumors are circulating around Lvov to the effect that there was recently a large discharge of radioactive matter at the Rovno nuclear electric power station [AES], and that people are feeling lethargic and weak and getting headaches as a result. Our correspondent asked V. Korovkin, director of Rovno AES, whether this was so:

"All this, to put it mildly, is the imagination of uninformed people," the director answered. "In Kuznetsovsk, where the AES is located, we have an indicator that provides constant information about the radiation level. It oscillates between 10 and 17 microroentgens. Before our power station was set up, the natural background was approximately the same."

[Klyucherov] Why do such scares arise from time to time?

[Korovkin] I think it is impossible to find a simple answer. It is partly the result of a negative attitude to AES's in general, partly the consequence of keeping back full information about the Chernobyl disaster for a long time, and also general mistrust of information coming from official organs. I believe there is only one way of fighting against radiation phobia—by giving everyone the possibility of having their own personal dosimeter.

[Klyucherov] And do special services frequently check the state of the environment around the AES?

[Korovkin] We cannot complain of a lack of attention on their part. A USSR Ministry of Health special radiation detachment has just finished work here. Its specialists brought the most up-to-date measuring equipment with them and they literally checked everything around—not just the territory of the AES, but also many establishments located outside it. For example, they took measurements in nursery schools, on beaches, at the bus station, and in dacha areas....

[Klyucherov] And finally: Have there been any serious unforeseen or emergency situations in the AES during the current year?

[Korovkin] No. Our staff are highly professional, experienced specialists. This has also been confirmed by International Atomic Energy Agency specialists, who carried out a detailed study of our power station's work from the security viewpoint.

Military

Military Chief Discusses Armed Forces Manning

LD1503133290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1158 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar (TASS)—"The seeming advantages, at first glance, of the territorial principle of manning, as opposed to the extra-territorial principle, are giving rise to many proposals for implementing precisely this principle of manning," said Colonel General Grigoriy Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. He gave an interview today to a TASS correspondent in connection with the approaching spring call-up into the USSR Armed Forces. In the words of the general, a particularly large number of such proposals on this issue come from citizens and informal associations of the Baltic and Transcaucasian union republics.

As Grigoriy Krivosheyev pointed out, various alternatives are being expressed for bringing the Army and Navy up to strength. The most serious of these, in the General's view, is the question of moving away from the extra-territorial toward the territorial principle of bringing the Armed Forces up to strength with personnel in compulsory service. According to this principle, the volume of transportation is sharply reduced, the national environment and familiar climatic conditions are preserved for recruits, and the opportunity is granted for servicemen to visit their families. Grigoriy Krivosheyev reiterated that the extra-territorial principle of manning means supplementing the Army and Navy with recruit contingents which live outside the areas where military units are stationed. The territorial principle of manning, on the other hand, envisions supplementing with personnel from recruit resources situated in the areas of their stationing.

In the view of the military commander, a deeper study of the territorial principle of manning makes it possible to see a whole series of significant shortcomings in it. Above all, manning according to this principle does not enable the Army and Navy to be provided with the necessary human resources.

The territorial principle of bringing the Armed Forces up to strength, Krivosheyev believes, contradicts the main fundamental tenet of official views of the protection of the state as a task for the whole state. The main principles of building the Armed Forces in the conditions of the Soviet Federation are altogether justified, because the common state task of protecting and defending the country cannot be carried out in the framework of regional or republican isolation.

Finally, service in the place of residence is less preferable from the point of view of developing and deepening national relations, because it does not promote the formation among young men of an internationalist feeling and a soldierly friendship of young people of different nationalities, and it deprives them of the opportunity of seeing the country, of becoming enriched by the culture of another nation, and of broading their horizons. This kind of service does not correspond to the principle of social justice and equality of citizens before the law. "A great many Soviet people demand in their letters compliance with the principle of bringing troops and naval forces up to strength that is unified for all," General Grigoriy Krivosheyev said in conclusion.

Yazov, Military Chiefs Meet on Draft Problems

PM1403152790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed own correspondent report: "With Concern About the Future Army and Navy"]

[Text] A conference of leading personnel of the mobilization organs of military districts and oblast, kray, and republic commissariats has been held. Colonel General G.F. Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, gave an analysis of their work in the year which has ended.

Concern about the qualitative characteristics of the draft, the state of its training, and also Army and Navy reserve training was expressed in the reports delivered by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy defense minister for cadres; and in the speeches by Lieutenant General A.F. Katusev, chief military prosecutor; Lieutenant General O.V. Zinchenko, member of the Military Council and chief of the Baltic Military District Political Directorate; and a number of military commissars.

Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, summed up the results of the conference.

Kiev Military District Forces Begin Exercise

LD1603102390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 16 Mar 89

[Text] Kiev, 16 Mar (TASS)—Today, on the territory of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the area of Belaya Tserkov, Korsun-Shevchenkovskiy, Grebenka, Shchors, Loyev, and Vyshgorod, an operational and tactical exercise by the troops of the Kiev Military District has begun for the purpose of improving the personnel's combat proficiency and working up issues of command and control and cooperation in the course of a defensive operation.

Taking part in the operation are subunits of the ground forces and the air forces with a total strength of 12,000 servicemen, including 4,000 called-up from the reserves, and approximately 350 tanks. The troops are advancing along routes agreed with the local authorities into the assembly areas and are starting to make them ready.

Baltic Republics

Official Discusses End of Military Commissariats

LD1503123890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1105 GMT 15 Mar 90

[From the "Press Review" presented by Algirdas Usas]

[Text] Among other official resolutions of the Supreme Council published in the press is—and no doubt very important to us all—the resolution on ending the activities of Military Commissariats of the USSR Ministry of Defense situated on the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. It is important, and no doubt painful, especially to those young people serving at present in the Soviet Army. This de jure and de facto collision is still present in many aspects of our work. So, today I telephoned the republican Military Commissariat. The commissariat is working and I spoke on the telephone to the department head, Steponas Ulevicius.

[Begin recording] [Ulevicius] You know, it is difficult to talk about these matters, because the commissariat is an organ of the Ministry of Defense, and there should be negotiations on whether it is legal to abolish its work. It is an organ of the Ministry of Defense and only the Ministry of Defense can end its activities. [words indistinct] Time will tell.

[Usas] What is your attitude to the desertion and return from the Army by soldiers and to the coming call-up?

[Ulevicius] I regard desertion in an absolutely negative way in any case. Everything must be solved in a legal way. They have been called-up. There must be decisions by the government, they must be released officially. [words indistinct] There must be government decisions. I think so. There must be more serious decisions, much more serious.

[Usas] And you are waiting for them?

[Ulevicius] No doubt about it. I am waiting for wise steps by the government with the union government. [end recording]

Official Criticizes Decision

LD1503153290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] We are receiving at the editorial office many telephone calls from you, esteemed radio listeners, on the resolutions adopted by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania on the USSR Armed Forces Military Commissariats and the fate of young people of call-up age. Here is an interview with the head of the political department of the Republican Military Commissariat, Konstantin Golubev:

[Begin recording] [Golubev] Recently the entire population of the republic was informed that the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania had adopted a resolution on the invalidity of the USSR Law on General Military Service, and that as of yesterday the activities of the Military Commissariats have been ended. Naturally, many people are interested in the reaction of officials at the Military Commissariats. Of course, we are bitter about such a resolution. We would say that this resolution is absurd, because the people understand very well and the legislators of the present parliament know that the Military Commissariat is subordinated to the USSR Ministry of Defense and that we only carry out their instructions and decisions. We consider this [resolution] to be interference in the functions of the central organs.

What was our reaction? Of course, we held a meeting of the personnel of the republic's Military Commissariats, adopted a corresponding resolution, and sent it to the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The Military Council of the Baltic Military Okrug has protested these events, and yesterday, at 1645, the commander of the garrison, I personally, and two other representatives handed this protest to Mr. Landsbergis in his residence and then had a conversation which lasted for 15 minutes.

I understood from the conversation that the leaders of the new parliament are not sufficiently clear in understanding the responsibility which they are assuming. It is also clear that they approach the solution of these problems with insufficient skill. Many questions were asked, and we had to talk about these decisions which they are making now. We drew their attention to the fact that they decided to return to the republic those servicemen who are now serving in the Armed Forces. This concerns 38,500 people. If we take into consideration the fact that every year we call up 16,000-17,000 people—and this year's call-up has already been decided—this amounts to roughly 57,000 people.

They promise an unemployment figure of 75,000 in the republic. So what will happen? I think that these people whom they are in hurry to return from the Armed Forces will ask them and will demand answers. Apart from the fact that we warned the leadership to leave the republic's Military Commissariats alone and not to take any actions, in principle there have already been attempts to do this. [Word indistinct] of the Sajudis, Comrade Kolesnikovas, telephoned the city Military Commissariat, stating that he had been authorized to conduct talks on its further activities. Of course, he received a negative answer, and the talks did not take place.

I think that this resulted in the restrained speeches by the deputies of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, Motieka, and Laurinkus, who yesterday behaved correctly in objecting in principle and in calling on the republic's population to treat the servicemen very tactfully and to avoid any provocations.

We asked people who, speculating on this resolution in the parliament, are trying to avoid the call-up and to ignore the law on military service, to think carefully above all, because the responsibility will come sooner or

later. But on the whole I must say that everyday operations at the Military Commissariats continue. People do not quite believe in the life's work of the legal acts which are being passed today and, as before, are looking for replies and solutions to their problems that arise every day with the officials of the Military Commissariats.

Today we have no refusniks. During conversations people express various wishes and are waiting for the final solution. We have data only for the previous years. We will start the spring call-up on 1 April, and only then will those who refuse to be called-up for service be exposed.

[Interviewer] Recently the newspaper IZVESTIYA carried an interview with USSR Minister of Defense Army General Dmitriy Yazov, where he stated that the call-up to the Army should be carried out not on behalf of the Ministry of Defense but on behalf of the Supreme Soviet, as the highest legislative authority.

[Golubev] This decision matured in the Military Commissariats, which feel that the time has come to make such a decision. We reported this more than once to the Ministry of Defense and to the Chief Political Directorate, and this decision is already acquiring the status of law. I think that it will be taken in the future; this is correct. [end recording]

[Announcer] That was an interview with the head of the political department of the Republican Military Commissariat, Konstantin Golubev. We had intended to ask Deputy of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Zigmas Vaisvila who, as is known, heads the commission on the country's defense in the new parliament, for comments on this recorded interview. Unfortunately, we were unable to contact the esteemed deputy before this broadcast.

Brazauskas Discusses Congress, Gorbachev Meeting

LD1603001990 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Yesterday Algirdas Brazauskas returned back from Moscow, where he participated in the Third Extraordinary Congress of Soviet People's Deputies. He informed the television viewers about the mood prevailing in Moscow. [words indistinct] one of the intermissions he spoke with Mikhail Gorbachev on the latter's initiative.

Mr. Gorbachev was interested to know in greater detail about the situation in Lithuania.

According to Algirdas Brazauskas, Mikhail Gorbachev was not enthusiastic about future negotiations with Lithuania, but on the other hand neither was he (?malevolent).

There is tension in Moscow at present. Meanwhile foreign newsmen are literally hunting down the representatives of Lithuania, asking them one and the same question over and over again: When are talks between Lithuania and Soviet Union going to take place?

Vytautas Landsbergis defined Mikhail Gorbachev as a (?wise-minded) and far seeing leader and expressed hope that negotiations with Moscow might not be too far away.

Algirdas Brazauskas thanked the people of Lithuania for sending him telegrams and letters of support and our worries about the future of Lithuania. I know perfectly well, said Mr. Brazauskas, that the present composition of the Supreme Council [words indinstict] the people of Lithuania have voted for themselves. And though Lithuanians have [words indistinct] the situation is normal, and the fact that the (?Kremlinists) have lost the election should not be frightening too. This is the result of the general mood prevailing now here in Lithuania. However, added Algirdas Brazauskas, I am ready to fight for the independence of Lithuania together with all the other members of parliament. The ultimate goal of restoring an independent Lithuanian State is (?written out) in the program of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Algirdas Brazauskas is participating actively in paving the way for future negotiations with Moscow. He called on everybody to unite not only in words but in deeds as well.

Landsbergis Cables Congratulations to Gorbachev

LD1503234690 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, has sent a telegram of congratulations to Mikhail Gorbachev on the occasion of his being elected executive president of the Soviet Union.

The telegram says that we are (?genuinely) glad that you were elected president of the country with which Lithuania has had two decades of good relations established by the founder of the Soviet state to overwhelming [words indistinct]. The process of perestroyka initiated by you [words indistinct] and lack of confidence. We congratulate you, and today Lithuania, as part of undivided and nonviolated Europe, [word indistinct] also envisage in your mind (?and) ours.

The text of this telegram was read to the Lithuanian Television viewers by Mr Landsbergis himself tonight.

Minister Congratulates Gorbachev

LD1603002990 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] The Soviet President-elect Mikhail Gorbachev was also congratulated by Professor Kasimiera Prunskiene, acting prime minister of Lithuania, on behalf of the Lithuanian Government.

A telegram says that Lithuania is eager to retain stable and mutually useful relations with the Soviet Union. The telegram also expresses hopes that Mikhail Gorbachev's

reaction to the decisions of sovereign Lithuania is going to be goodwill and favorable.

Formation of Commission on Independence Issues

90UN1170C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 27 Feb 90 p 1

[Speech by A. Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the 15th session of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation: "The Agenda's First Question"]

[Text] Esteemed deputies! In accordance with paragraph 2 of the 12 November 1989 Resolution of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, "On a Historical and Legal Evaluation of the Events of 1940 in Estonia," the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet has reserved for itself the right to organize negotiations on interrelations in a Union of sovereign soviet states and international associations.

Proceeding from the decisions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet on 26 January 1990, a Commission on the Economic and Political Independence of Estonia was formed and its chairman was appointed.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is charged with determining the composition of this commission. You have been presented with the 31 January 1990 Resolution of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the Commission on the Economic and Political Independence of Estonia. Talks with the members of the commission have taken place in order to secure their agreement to take part in the work of the commission. The composition of the commission has also been discussed in a consultative committee under the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It was decided that all political movements, appropriate departments, USSR people's deputies elected in Estonia, as well as representatives of citizens committees of Estonia should be represented on the commission where possible. I should note that, despite a preliminary spoken understanding, Tunne Kelam and Trivimi Veliste, members of the Main Citizens Committee of Estonia, have refused to participate in the work of the commission.

At a meeting of the commission the proposal was made to form seven working groups within the commission headed for the most part by USSR people's deputies: A working group on political and legal issues—chairman A. Ryuytel; a working group on military problems—chairman V. Vare; a working group on economic activities—chairman I. Toome; a working group on financial issues—chairman R. Otsason; a working group on the preservation of the environment—chairman T. Frey; a working group on issues of nationality and migration—chairman G. Golubkov; and a working group on foreign relations—chairman E. Lippmaa.

I will also note that the declaration adopted on 2 February at a general meeting of Estonian SSR deputies of all levels says that, with the goal of reestablishing an independent Estonia and proceeding from the acts of the Tartu Peace Treaty, Estonia is to begin constructive negotiations through its representatives with all parties upon whom the reestablishment of a de facto sovereign Estonian republic depends.

The text of the declaration was transmitted to M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I did this personally, and we had a prolonged conversation. The text of the declaration was also sent to the general secretary of the United Nations, to states participating in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and to other states. It was also sent to the embassies of the United States, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, the PRC, Spain, the Netherlands, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, Canada, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Portugal, France, Sweden, Romania, the GDR, the FRG, Finland, Great Britain, Denmark, Hungary, and New Zealand.

At a meeting of the consultative committee under the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet on 21 February it was considered necessary to address the USSR Congress of People's Deputies regarding the question of Estonian state independence. It is intended that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies will acknowledge Estonia's noninclusion in the USSR.

I propose that you adopt a resolution on this question, the draft of which has been distributed to you and which I am making public. The draft resolution was discussed at a session of the Estonia Supreme Soviet Presidium and approved by the Council of Elders.

List of Members

90UN1170B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 25 Feb 90 p 2

["Commission on the Economic and Political Independence of Estonia"]

[Text] **Chairman**

A. Ryuytel—chairman of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR people's deputy.

Members

A. Almann—secretary of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
M. Bronshteyn—head of the department of political economy at Tartu University, USSR people's deputy;
T. Frey—professor at Tartu University, chairman of the board of the Estonian Green Movement;
G. Golubkov—director of the Azeriskiy ceramics factory, USSR people's deputy;
A. Gren—Estonian SSR minister of foreign affairs, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
I. Gryazin—department head at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputy;

R. Khagelberg—adviser to the chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
K. Khallik—lead scientific associate at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputy;
S. Kallas—chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Trade Unions, USSR people's deputy;
K. Kiysk—member of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
A. Kiris—Estonian SSR minister of justice;
Ya. Kyarner—rector of Tartu University;
A. Keyerna—president of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
M. Laurstin—head of the Department of Journalism at Tartu University, USSR people's deputy;
E. Lippmaa—director of the Institute of Chemical and Biological Physics of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputy;
A. Maksimenko—chairman of the Sillamyae City Soviet;
N. Mikheyeva—first secretary of the Kokhtla-Yarveskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] of the Communist Party of Estonia, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
M. Mikiver—chairman of the Estonian Union of Theater Workers, USSR people's deputy;
L. Meri—director of the Institute of Estonia, writer;
E. Myandmaa—Estonian SSR minister of finance, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
Yu. Nugis—general director of the "Estoplast" Production Association, chairman of the board of the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives, USSR people's deputy;
R. Otsason—president of the Estonian Bank, USSR people's deputy;
K. Payula—archbishop of the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church;
E. Pyldroos—artist, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
E. Reytsnik—general director of the department of Estonian SSR State Statistics;
O. Saveli—rector of the Estonian Agricultural Academy, chairman of the Estonian Union of Farmers;
E. Savisaar—Estonian SSR minister of economics, USSR people's deputy;
E.-A. Sillari—secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
Kh. Sheyn—president of the association of nationalities of Estonia;
A. Tamm—farmer, chairman of the Central Union of Farmers of Estonia;
B. Tamm—rector of the Tallinn Technical University, member of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
M. Titma—secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee;
I. Toome—chairman of the Estonian SSR Government, USSR people's deputy;
V. Chuykin—chairman of the Narva City Soviet;
E. Cherevashko—Estonian SSR minister, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
Yu. Uluots—director of the Palivereskiy factory of construction materials of Khaapsaluskiy Uyezd, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
V. Vare—senior scientific associate at the Institute of History of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputy;
T. Varek—chairman of the board of the "Viru" collective farm of Rakvereskiy Uyezd, USSR people's deputy;
V. Veskivyali—Estonian SSR minister of industry and power engineering, deputy of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet;
A. Vyali—Estonian SSR minister of agriculture, USSR people's deputy;
V. Vyalyas—first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, USSR people's deputy.
[Signed] A. Almann, secretary of the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet

Lithuanian Party Responds to Gorbachev Reaction

LD1603000490 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] [first announcer] The newly elected Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, said in his inauguration speech there was a pressing need to work out a new treaty of the union which would provide a sound basis for the unity of all the Soviet republics as members of a single union. At the same time President Gorbachev said each republic should make up its mind whether to remain a part of the union or leave it. The mechanism and procedures for doing so would be determined by the USSR Parliament, with the president. Our reporter put in a call to Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, which recently proclaimed itself a sovereign and independent state, and spoke to Algimantas Zukas, a spokesman for the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Asked how he viewed the problem of working out such a mechanism, he replied:

[Second announcer] I'm not all that sure a mutually acceptable mechanism will be worked out. But I'm convinced that there must be a broad consensus in this field. We are saying that the mechanism regulating the secession of the republic should be balanced by another mechanism regulating a republic's decision to become part of the Soviet Union. In 1940 when Lithuania was incorporated in the USSR, contrary to its peoples' will, there was no such mechanism. That has been acknowledged by the republic so the procedure for working it out must be approached from this point of view.

[First announcer] Algimantas Zukas saw a contradiction in the first that while the mechanism is to be worked out in Moscow, decisions to secede have been taken by the republics Lithuania, Estonia and Georgia, and what is most important in his view is that the mechanism should envisage all the aspects of recognizing each republic's distinct statehood. Last Monday the Lithuanian Parliament drafted a letter to Moscow asking for recognition of Lithuania's independence and for talks on restoring its sovereignty. The immediate reaction in Moscow was a

statement by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, that we conduct talks only with foreign states. This was his reaction before he was elected president of the Soviet Union. More about this from Algimantas Zukas:

[Second announcer] So far we have not received any official reaction from Moscow. His election demonstrates that he is the man with whom we should conduct talks and determine the procedure of secession.

[First announcer] The head of the USSR State Planning Committee, Yuriy Masluykov, when asked about the possible consequences of Lithuania's secession, said the Soviet Union would bill the republic in hard currency for Soviet investments in industry and infrastructure during the past half century to the tune of 21 billion rubles, or 34 billion dollars. The immediate reaction from the republic was a statement that it would in turn bill the USSR for the people killed during Stalin's rule and for the economic havoc caused by half a century of mismanagement. Is this reciprocity policy effective and will it help us to find a way out of the deadlock? Algimantas Zukas:

[Second announcer] Our politicians and economists are studying all aspects of the procedure, but, of course, if the issue of sending us a bill does arise we would respond in kind.

Autonomous Lithuanian Komsomol Congress Held

PM1403154090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 p 1

[Special correspondents A. Ganelin and V. Zarovskiy report: "We Will Go to Moscow"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Congress of the Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol [Communist Youth League] opened 10 March in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, and closed 11 March in what was by then the Lithuanian Republic.

Everything happens very quickly nowadays in the Baltic region. It does not seem long since the congress of Lithuania's Lenin Komsomol members formed the new autonomous organization, the Lithuanian Komsomol. The logo was changed, and the banners were sent back to Moscow. But there were still people who wanted to be in the All-Union Lenin Komsomol. At first, this did not seem to be a great problem. But we were told that things like this were happening: Schoolchildren were going to the Komsomol Rayon Committee and asking: "Where do you join the All-Union Komsomol?" They were told: "Over there, at the military unit." So they went there. For instance: Volodya Ovdiyenko, deputy chief of the Political Department at the Vilnius Higher Command School for Radio Electronics —a military academy—was giving out Komsomol membership cards to schoolchildren.

But what is to be done? This question was discussed at the republican congress by delegates representing 32,000 people. They themselves ordered a new logo and collected money for a conference. This conference was sought by a meeting of the Lithuanian Komsomol aktiv, at which it was said that the Lithuanian Komsomol's ideas are close to social democracy, and that today, of the old monolithic features, there remains only the name that does not correspond to its nature and aims.

...In the hall, above the stage, is a large white square. In the upper corner is the Komsomol badge, in the lower corner—the national flag of the republic. And along the diagonals between them is the inscription: The Constituent United Council of the Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol. Does this inscription unite the two symbols? Surely cooperation between the Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol and other youth organizations in the republic is not impossible? Very many points in their programs are similar. There are economic problems, there is the creation of a democratic society based on the rule of law. The difference lies elsewhere. Some are for a sovereign Lithuania within the USSR, others for a sovereign Lithuania outside it.

Although a poster announcing that the conference was to take place hung on the doors of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Komsomol and the leadership was invited, the founder members were not to be seen in the hall. They even feared the picketing of their event. Their fears were groundless.

An interesting detail: The conference took place in the Palace of Sport and Leisure at the Ministry of Internal Affairs. On the third floor a session of the Komsomol members was taking place, on the second, in the bar, many were watching a live transmission of a session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and on the first floor there was a noisy discotheque. All this recalled the situation facing young people in Lithuania. Some want the Komsomol, others—a separate state, whilst others again want neither politics nor pickets at all. Of any kind. Much was discussed at the congress.

All the same, the congress decided for the creation of a Lithuanian Lenin Communist Youth League, for ideological unity with the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform. Two delegates are to go to the 21st All-Union Lenin Komsomol Congress, and a supreme organ was created—the Republican Center, instead of the Central Committee.

...And meanwhile, the republic Supreme Soviet was still in session, decisions were being taken and resolutions adopted concerning the restoration of an independent Lithuania: The coat of arms was changed, and the name of the republic. Events will continue to develop. In what direction?

Report on Lithuanian Party Bureau Meeting

90UN1101H Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 20 Feb 90 p 1

[ELTA Report: "Returning to the People: Visiting Meeting of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau in Trakay"]

[Text] The independent Lithuanian Communist Party [LiCP] is taking its first steps in its practical activities. Only two months have passed since the 20th LiCP Congress, and the republic's communists are now undergoing a process of self-determination. How are matters in Trakayskiy Rayon? This question was discussed at a LiCP Central Committee Bureau meeting that took place on 19 February at the Trakayskiy Raykom [rayon party committee].

In order to better acquaint themselves with the situation in the rayon's local organizations, members of the LiCP Central Committee Bureau, V. Arbachyauskas, Z. Baltsevich, V. Berezov, K. Glavyatskas, Yu. Nekroshyus, R. Pavilenis, R. Purtulis, Yu. Pozhela, Yu. Paletskis, M. Stakvilyavichyus, and V. Velikonis visited Elektrenay, Vevise, Aukshtadvarise, the "Grigishkes" Production Association, the Lentvaris carpet factory, and the "Pastrevis" collective farm.

But the situation in the rayon's party organizations are rather complicated, as are the national composition of the population and its social and economic problems. At the Elektrenay GRES [State Rayon Electric Power Station] more than 200 communists became members of the independent LiCP. But in the "Grigishkes" Production Association, only 30 out of 280 made the same decision. What is keeping communists from taking the decisive step? The questions that the members of the LiCP Central Committee Bureau asked the people of the production association prompted them to think about that. Has a program for the republic's transition to economic independence been prepared, what is the role of the soviets of the labor collectives at the enterprises, how could the party function in the labor collectives, what is the party's attitude toward the activities of the trade cooperatives, does the LiCP (on the CPSU platform) have the right to call itself the Lithuanian Communist Party, what are the prospects for cooperation between the two parties, what will be the fate of people of other nationalities after independence is proclaimed in Lithuania?

This session of the LiCP Central Committee Bureau was also attended by members of the Trakayskiy Raykom and the secretaries of the rayon's local party organizations. As he opened the session, A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the LiCP Central Committee, noted that the LiCP currently unites more than 81,000 communists and that its ranks have prospects for growth. On the road to independence for the republic it is important for all the political forces in Lithuania to be steadfast because there are difficult trials ahead. He emphasized that it is necessary to begin to execute the Program and Statute of the LiCP immediately. A. Brazauskas told the audience about the February plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and its results.

Yonas Gribauskas, first secretary of the Trakayskiy Raykom, gave a report on the situation in the rayon's party organization. He informed the plenum's participants that out of 3,300 members of the CPSU, about 1,300 transferred to the independent LiCP. There are already 75 local party organizations formed in the rayon. Their leaders have become people who enjoy authority. However, the fact that 250 members of the party have returned their party membership cards to the committee causes unease.

Leonora Urbanavichene, a teacher at Trakay secondary school No. 2, spoke about the danger of passivity and indifference. She stressed that many already do not believe in anything because of the difficult living conditions. It is necessary to take decisive steps to awaken people's national consciousness.

Lyudmila Yanulenene, deputy director of the rayon consumer services center, said, I do not agree that the rayon's residents of other nationalities repudiate the idea of the independence of the LiCP. The decision was made by more than half of the communists in our party organization. And it includes many Russians and Poles.

Niyole Dochkuvene, chairman of the raykom of the trade union of cultural workers, believes that each person should be seen through the prism of conscientious and honest work, and not through that of political convictions.

Members of the LiCP Central Committee Bureau, Yu. Nekroshyus, M. Stakvilyavichyus, V. Velikonis, and the writer V. Petkyavichyus shared their thoughts at the meeting.

Summarizing the thoughts expressed at the meeting of the LiCP Central Committee Bureau, A. Brazauskas noted that the rich information that was received will be used in the practical work of the party and will help it to avoid mistakes. The difficult social and economic situation in Trakay has come about for both objective and subjective reasons, and the newly elected Lithuanian Supreme Soviet will have to correct the situation. Lithuania has difficult trials ahead. At this crucial moment the LiCP has been called upon to play an important and crucial role. As a result it must be closer to people and try to listen to the opinion of each of them. It also must not forget that there are still forces that are trying to kindle the hostility of the public in the Soviet Union toward the Lithuanian people. However, A. Brazauskas said in conclusion, an invented truth does not last long. No one can make us turn from the path leading to the goal we have selected.

Party Official Interviewed on Lithuanian Issues

90UN1101F Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 21 Feb 90 p 2

[Interview with V. Shved, secretary of the provisional Lithuania Communist Party Central Committee (loyal to the CPSU), by unidentified ELTA correspondent; date and place not specified: "V. Shved: For a Socialist Lithuania in the USSR"]

[Text] **Representatives of the LiCP [Lithuanian Communist Party] (loyal to the CPSU) are also taking part in the elections to the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. There are 91 of them. Who are they and how do you rate the chances for these candidates for deputy to the republic's parliament? A correspondent from ELTA asked Vladislav Shved, secretary of the LiCP provisional Central Committee this question.**

[Shved] Our candidates were widely nominated in Vilnius, Klaipeda, and Shalchininkai. They are workers and intellectuals, Lithuanians, Russians, Poles, and all those that our party has united. They are all honest, conscientious people. Take for example M. Shkulepu, an adjustor at the Vilnius Geiger-counter factory. He is the father of five children, a front-rank worker, and secretary of the October Raykom [rayon committee] of the LiCP in Vilnius. I can also name two professors—Yu. Yermalavichyus and I. Kucherov. It is genuinely difficult for them to take part in the election contest, inasmuch as there have been attempts to create an unfavorable atmosphere around them. But I believe that with time people will understand who is who. It is just a pity that there is so very little time before the elections.

[ELTA] What is the election platform of the candidates for deputy to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet?

[Shved] It consists of four points. In brief it can be stated this way: A socialist Lithuania in the USSR; social justice and the right to work; an independent labor collective as the basis of the republic's sovereignty; equality for the representatives of all peoples living in Soviet Lithuania.

[ELTA] In your speech at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum you feared that if the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet were to pass a decree acknowledging that the 21 July 1940 Declaration of the People's Sejm of Lithuania was illegal, then many of the CPSU's supporters in the republic would find themselves outside the law. And in fact that decree was passed. What are the grounds for your anxiety?

[Shved] What bothers us today? Yes, we are part of the CPSU. But we do not intend to defend the interests of the central authorities. Our goal is to defend the aspirations of all members of the CPSU. Some see danger for Lithuania in this concept. Incidentally, we should also remember the draft on the activities of the parties in the republic, which said that the parties of other countries may not operate in Lithuania. In a word, our anxiety is not without grounds.

[ELTA] How do you evaluate the current situation with two communist parties existing in Lithuania? How do you understand the concept of a Lithuanian Communist Party? The LiCP, like the parties of the other soviet republics, has existed for a long time but its independence has existed only in name. There are practically no representatives of the republic on the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Up until now the practice has existed of sending the Central Committee's second secretaries from Moscow to the other republics. All instructions come down from the center. So what kind of independence are we talking about?

[Shved] This is not a normal phenomenon. Up until now the Rules of the CPSU were ambiguous. There is a republic communist party, but there are no republic party organizations. As we know, the published program of the CPSU Central Committee plans to rectify the existing situation. Having two communist parties in the republic is a completely negative phenomenon. Therefore I suggest that there were neither winners nor losers at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Only a bitter truth was established—at the 20th LiCP Congress all communists suffered a defeat and a portion of them changed their ideological orientation.

I am not against federalism, but I suggest that now, while internal contradictions are splitting the USSR, the subject cannot be discussed.

[ELTA] The essence of the contradictions between the independent LiCP and your party, as you said at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum, consists of the following: "Either in the Union or out of the Union." You believe that Lithuania should not be subject to dictate and bureaucratic centralism. We agree with that. But how can this be achieved? The first steps of economic independence for the republic already show how the center reacts to the republic's desire to be independent....

[Shved] In fact, an abnormal situation has arisen in the economy. Some insist that "the center is showing its teeth." In my opinion, this is instead the result of the center's helplessness—many of the country's enterprises connected with our republic do not fulfill their agreements. This has become an all-union phenomenon, the result of the country's economic crisis. Miners from Vorkuta or metallurgists from Cherepovets say that they will give everyone coal and steel but that in return they should receive food goods. It is a pity, but we are returning to the barter system again.

[ELTA] After the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum the representatives of the independent LiCP appeared widely on the radio and television and their press conferences were broadcast. In the meantime, the secretaries of the provisional LiCP Central Committee, who took part in the plenum have been silent with the

exception of the television show "Panorama," where you and M. Burokyavichyus were interviewed. How do you explain this? Is this the result of political suppression and persecution?

[Shved] Incidentally, the interview on "Panorama" proved that we cannot get much of a forum on television. I asked to be given the opportunity to conduct a press conference, I spoke seven minutes, and I had two sentences left. But when a small dispute with M. Burokyavichyus occurred, the television workers insisted that they would not make the recording.

[ELTA] In conclusion I would like to learn your opinion on the processes taking place in Eastern Europe and the defeat of the communists in almost all the countries of the former socialist community.

[Shved] I believe that the reasons are the same everywhere. The communist parties have become a state within a state, they decide all questions, and they take all responsibility on their own shoulders. And in the face of economic difficulties the monopolistic party system did not justify itself. The communists must fight for the vanguard role and proceed from the principles of humanism and positive examples, not from a position of strength.

Reporter Reviews New Lithuanian Media Law

90US0622A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 2 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent in Vilnius R. Motskus: "Fines up to 30,000 Envisaged in Press Law Passed in Lithuania"]

[Text] *Overall the provisions of the law strengthen freedom of the press. And it is also clearly and unambiguously emphasized that the mass media are not subject to censorship. No interference in their affairs is allowed. One article defines the principles for the press: It should be guided by the ideals of humanism, equality, tolerance, and respect for the individual and other common human values, and should promote the spread of democracy and glasnost and public and state progress.*

The press has the undisputed right to obtain information from state, political, and public organizations. The restrictions on the mass media are also defined quite clearly. First of all it is not permitted to disclose state secrets. Other kinds of restrictions are possible, essential for guaranteeing the rights of the republic and its inhabitants. The dissemination of pornography is forbidden.

The treatment of pieces printed about people accused of violations of the law until the courts have ruled has generated many disputes. Jurists have demanded a clear taboo while journalists want complete freedom. A compromise has been reached. The law provides that nothing may be published about preliminary data without permission, nor may articles that violate the principle of presumption of innocence or that may influence the court. A separate section regulates procedure for institutions of the mass media. Here the law is guided not by the principle of whether or not it is permitted, but just the question of registration. About 90 percent of states in the world proceed on this principle. As is known, in one of the drafts for the law on the central press a restriction was placed on the right of individuals to start up a publication. In the Lithuanian version there is no such restriction. For example, the satirical newspaper KRANKLIS, which is produced by one person, writer L. Kauleykis, is already being widely circulated.

Under the new law the rights of editorial offices and editors are fixed in contracts between the publishers and the editorial offices. Newspapers will have an opportunity to establish their own technical and economic policies on the basis of the law on enterprises (the collective). There is one interesting section in which the rights and obligations of journalists are defined. In my opinion, it has achieved a balance between journalists and society and the rights of citizens and their dignity are unambiguously protected. Apart from other procedures, provision is made even for compensation for moral damages if information is published that is not in accord with reality, up to R30,000. In addition to other cases, this also applies to making public information about the private life of an individual without his agreement.

The law makes provision for a clear-cut procedure for printing retractions: at the initiative of the press organ itself or following a court ruling. The mass media may refuse to retract information published and are absolved of responsibility in the following cases: if the information being denied is available in official documents and reports of the organs of power and management, or political or public organizations and movements, if the information has been repeated in public statements, and if it was received from other information agencies.

The local newspaper RESPUBLIKA recently published information about an incident in the Moscow publication GOLOS IZBIRATLEYA, which was printed in the Vilnius government printing house. It contained the copy of a document affecting the interests of the USSR Procuracy. RESPUBLIKA writes that it was decided to destroy 15,000 copies of GOLOS IZBIRATELYA. The remaining copies of the issue were confiscated by the militia during an inspection of the Vilnius- Moscow train. And so the reference to the newspaper RESPUBLIKA absolves me and my editorial office of responsibility, which rests entirely with the above newspaper.

For the first time a legislative provision has been introduced about confidentiality of sources of information. The mass media are not obliged to name a source of information and they do not have the right to publish the name of a person who has provided information without his agreement.

And the final piece of news: the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recently reorganized GOSUDARSTVENNYYE IZVESTIYA, making it a daily

instead of a weekly. The newspaper TIESA (PRAVDA) will become the newspaper of the Lithuanian Communist Party while SOVETSKAYA LITVA and KURYER VILENSKI will be published by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Concludes Session

LD1503191290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent (?Haerme Lenk) from the 15 March session of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, held in Tallinn—live or recorded]

[Text] A number of important questions in the Republic's life were examined by the deputies today. Among them a decision was made on creating a Bank of Estonia and on a partial amendment to the Republic's budget to develop agriculture. The draft law on labor service, an alternative to service in the Armed Forces, had its first reading.

Incidentally, the 11th Supreme Soviet of the Republic has met for the last time. On Sunday 18 March elections for new members of Estonia's supreme body of authority will be held. The next session will be conducted in this same hall by new people. It will probably be more difficult for the 12th Supreme Soviet to adopt decisions as, for the first time since the war, representatives of various political parties will work together in this hall.

The new composition of the new body of deputies and its political line will be decided during next Sunday's elections.

Results of Session

LD1503210490 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Here in Estonia the last session of the present convocation of the Supreme Soviet was held today. Those who had time and opportunity could follow its work in our live relay; for the others here is a brief summary from Gunnar Pael:

[Begin Pael recording] The final session was attended by 234 people's deputies. [passage omitted]

The work of the session was fruitful and the long awaited Law on Labor Service was adopted. It will serve as an altenative option alongside Army service.

The Supreme Soviet endorsed the government's proposal and altered the current year's budget.

Two million rubles were (?allocated) for developing private farms.

Today a union act concerning taxes on the wage fund was ended. The act had been an obstacle to our economic activity.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet acquired extensive authority until the new convocation of the Supreme Soviet starts work. Also elected to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet were Arno Koorna, Toomas Leito, Enn Poldroos, (Ants Tammleht), (Valeriy Kuznetsov), and (Toomas Parek).

Messages were approved to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Committee. A telegram was dispatched to Mikhail Gorbachev on his taking up the post of president. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Republic Question Discussed

LD1503130390 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Excerpts] [correspondent Gunner Paal] There are 13 questions on the agenda of the last session of the present convocation of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet which opened two hours ago at Toompea [in Tallinn]. Juhan Aare [USSR people's deputy, journalist] proposed today that the question of declaring the Republic of Estonia be placed on the agenda, but the proposal failed to receive the session's support.

[Begin recording] [Paal] Tiit Kabin [USSR people's deputy], how would you comment on this question not having been included on the agenda of today's session?

[Kabin] It is quite natural that it was not included on the agenda in a wording of this kind, because, as is known, the Republic of Estonia was indeed declared on 24 February 1918. What is at issue now is not another declaration, but the discontinuing of the annexation and a restoration of an indepenent Estonian state. [passage omitted]

Perhaps the most essential point here is that a couple of days ago the Estonian Congress ended. The declarations and resolutions which it adopted have been published, and the paths and plans for restoring Estonian independence have clearly been set down in writing, how it should take place. It is quite natural that should the Supreme Soviet also undertake to discuss the questions of restoring the Republic of Estonia, it should do so in harmony with the Estonian Congress, because proceeding along different paths, searching for different solutions, when one of them rules out the other, will inevitably simply confuse the people and spoil perhaps both paths. So I would stress once again that joint and close cooperation between namely the Estonian Congress and the Supreme Soviet is indeed very essential.

[Paal] And there is indeed a question on the agenda which discusses this cooperation.

[Kabin] This is necessary at the present time because, for instance, this present election campaign prior to 18 March demonstrates already that party rivalry has come down to perhaps not to settling misunderstandings between the parties, but often those between individuals. An essential issue of this kind, which is indeed the

concern of the whole Estonian people and the wish of the whole Estonian people, is an independent republic of Estonia—we must be extremely accurate here, extremely correct, so that together we will proceed along the same path. If in this respect we start following different paths, with one eliminating the other, we may simply postpone achieving the resolution of the issue.

[Paal] And the question related to the Republic of Estonia quite naturally belongs primarily within the competence of the new convocation.

[Kabin] Quite so. [passage omitted]

[Paal] Juhan Aare, what do you say about the session's decision?

[Aare] [passage omitted] Perhaps some deputies upon whom the matter finally depended would have agreed to a discussion on the subject, but evidently they did not have sufficient readiness to adopt a resolution now, today, even if I personally say that this should be done today. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Estonia Issues Resolution on Independence

90UN1170A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 25 Feb 90 p 2

[Resolution of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on Preparations for Estonian State Independence]

[Text] **The Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] resolves:**

1. To propose that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies examine, from the perspective of the 12 November 1989 Resolution of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet "On a Historical and Legal Evaluation of the Events of 1940 in Estonia" and of the 24 December 1989 Resolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies "On a Political and Legal Evaluation of the 1939 Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact," the issue of the legality of the law "On the Admission of the Estonian SSR to the USSR" passed on 6 August 1940 by the USSR Supreme Soviet, inasmuch as the "Declaration on the Entry of Estonia into the USSR" promulgated on 22 July 1940 by the State Duma of Estonia was not an expression of the free will of the people of Estonia and as a result is acknowledged to be legally invalid.

2. To inform the USSR Congress of People's Deputies of the "Declaration on the Issue of Estonian State Independence" passed on 2 February 1990 by the Estonian SSR People's Deputies, which acknowledges the need to restore the Estonian Republic on the basis of the Tartu Peace Treaty concluded 2 February 1920.

3. On the basis of the foregoing, to propose that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies begin official negotiations between the USSR and the Estonian SSR on the restoration of de facto independence to the Estonian Republic based on acknowledgement of the validity of the Tartu Peace Treaty.

4. To approve the staff of the Commission on Economic and Political Independence of Estonia which was formed as the result of a 31 January 1990 resolution of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

5. To propose that an international conference on the reunification of Germany include Estonia among the conference participants as a state which was directly affected by the 1939 aggression.

6. To inform the USSR Government of the desire of the Estonian SSR to take part in the Second All-Europe Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe as an independent state and to solicit the support of the USSR Government.

7. To inform the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian SSR and the Lithuanian SSR, the governments of the FRG and the GDR, and the president of the Republic of Finland of the present resolution.

[Signed] A. Ryutel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
A. Almann, secretary of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
Tallinn, 23 February 1990

Gorbachev's Attitude to Baltic Issue Discussed

LD1603113490 Riga in Latvian to Europe 1830 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Information from Moscow on a question of a very great interest to us. What will be the attitude of Mikhail Gorbachev, already elected to his new position, toward the rights of self-determination of the Baltic states? This morning Latvian Radio communicated with USSR People's Deputy Anatolijs Gorbunovs in order to question him on what the situation is concerning the talks on restoring the independence of the Baltic region between these states and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[Begin Gorbunovs recording] Well, you see, it is very difficult with Gorbachev. With him, we, at least I, have on a couple of occasions, I have talked very specifically with him and Lukyanov. Once, he says in such a way, yes, yes, we must definitely do this. Then again he says: no kind of talks, but we shall only examine the issue. [passage omitted]

But, you see, there again it will be, I think, like that. The Congress will end right away, and, evidently, some kind of decision will have to adopted in this connection.

But it will begin with a concrete examination of our program. But our concrete program is only, for the time being, a kind of political program, but immediately also economic matters will have to be examined. In what

manner will our economic union proceed? This is another question, and it is very essential, and it will become the main one.

Because, you see, what will certainly begin there? What concerns the year 1940, then, it seems to me, the counterarguments there will be very weak, and there they, I think, also cannot counterargue anything.

Second, that we need our statehood they cannot deny either, because they cannot ensure our equal rights, or any other republic's at the highest organ of state power or otherwise. Therefore they will certainly press toward the following: other republics, please, have your say; how will your ties develop further, economic ones and so on? [passage omitted]

[We must] very specifically propose (?regular) exchanges of treaties and so on. The only ones who have managed to move realistically forward are the Lithuanians. They have an organ of state power elected by the entire people, and this must be taken into consideration here, although Gorbachev announced that it was not juridically right, and so on. Well, he did announce that.

Nevertheless, elections are most important, because all that remains in these past two days could swerve one way or another; at least I cannot see that there could be anything realistic. The most important day now, it seems to me, is this Sunday. [end recording]

[Announcer] That was Anatolijs Gorbunovs from Moscow. It is, however, clear that until all the questions envisaged at the Congress are decided, it is doubtful whether Mikhail Gorbachev and other leaders of the country will have time to pay special attention to the Baltic matter. [passage omitted]

Report on Statistics for Latvian Candidates

90UN1144A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 27 Feb 90 p 3

[Article by V. Smetannikov: "How Many Contenders Today?"]

[Text] An important stage has been completed in the campaign for elections of LaSSR [Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic] People's Deputies—candidate nomination and registration by the district electoral commissions. There have been 584 contenders designated overall in the republic. 388 individuals have been registered as candidates for 201 seats in the parliament.

The difference in these figures is explained by the fact that many failed to gather 500 votes at the conferences and meetings in which they were nominated, as required by law. For some, this has probably been quite annoying—they find themselves pushed away from their cherished goal by just 3-4 dozen votes.

These and other data were presented yesterday at a press conference for representatives of the republic and central mass media. The conference was chaired by G. Blum ffrom the LaSSR Central Electoral Commission.

In particular it was reported that, during the candidate nomination period, 989 conferences and assemblies of labor collectives were conducted; there were 735 assemblies of voters by place of residence. Additionally, 98 assemblies and plenums of various social organizations took place, and there were 72 meetings of military personnel proposing their candidates to the Latvian Parliament.

It is felt our readers would also be interested in learning that 94 percent of the registered candidates are vying for the first time for deputy seats to the highest state organ of the republic. Among the candidates, 69 percent are party members; 45.9 percent are representatives of the Latvian People's Front (some of whom are CPSU members); 16 percent—representatives of the Latvian Agrarian Union; two percent—from Interfront; and a few individuals each from the Latvian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, Greens Party, and the Movement of the Naticnal Independence of Latvia. For the first time in republic elections, two members of the clergy are registered as candidates.

Women are clearly in the minority among the contenders—7.4 percent, 4.1 percent of the candidates are under 30 years of age; most are 40-50 years old.

Of the total number of candidates, 4.1 percent are workers and 10.3 percent—farm laborers. All segments of the intelligentsia are broadly represented, including the creative and scientific-technical intelligentsia.

The distribution of candidates by ethnic composition is as follows (in percent):

Latvian—62.5; Russian—26.5; Ukrainian—3.6; Belorussian—1.5; Pole—1.2; Jew—1.0. There are also representatives from certain other nationalities.

Most electoral districts have two individuals in contention for each seat. Elections without a choice—where there is only one candidate—will take place in 48 of the districts. "Records" have been broken in Riga electoral districts No. 29 and No. 46, where five candidates are registered in each.

Thus, 388 people are entering the competition for votes of the electorate. But I should state that this is not the final figure. As K. Blum has informed us, two contenders went to People's Court to dispute their rejection as registered candidates by district commissions; four protests have been registered with the Central Electoral Commission. The outcome regarding these conflicts will become known in the next few days.

Caucasus

Armenian, Azerbaijani Rayon Officials Meet

LD1503142990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] A meeting has been held between representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan. The main aim of the meeting is to work out joint measures to stabilize the situation on the border between Armenia's Gorisskiy Rayon and Azerbaijan's Lachinskiy Rayon, to create secure living conditions, and to guarantee the peaceful work of citizens.

Yet another step has been taken toward stabilizing the situation in Transcaucasia, reports a correspondent of the ARMENPRESS agency. Major-General Safonov, commandant of the rayon under the state of emergency, the deputy internal affairs ministers of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Azerbaijan SSR, party and local soviet workers of these republics, and members of the Armed Forces took part in the meeting. (Aleksanyan), first secretary of the Gorisskiy Rayon party committee, told the correspondent that, of course, one meeting cannot completely solve all problems, but the main thing is that decisions are being supplemented by specific actions.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Warns of Village Evictions

NC1403155090 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Appeal by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium—ARMENPRES headline]

[Text] Yerevan, 12 Mar (ARMENPRES)—Today's republican press has published the following statement distributed by ARMENPRES:

The result of the infusion of fear through acts of oppression, the climate of blackmail and threats, and the prolonged blockade of the roads and the obstruction of the air transport—which has deprived the population of consumer and health services—was that the native Armenian inhabitants of Azat and Kamo villages in the Getashen subrayon of Khanlarskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] abandoned their ancestors' lands within a few days. This same threat hangs over Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous Oblast, NKAO], Khanlarskiy and Shaumyanovskiy Rayons, and other Armenian villages in NKAO.

According to the testimony of inhabitants in that region, despite the existing curfew, under the threat of physical extermination, and with the complicity of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops, the Armenians are being forced to sell their houses and to falsify documents in the process.

The governing and law enforcement bodies of the republic are receiving numerous complaints from the inhabitants of the villages noted above about the enforced sale of their houses. Nevertheless, dozens of families have declined to sell their houses and more than 50 families have expressed the desire to return to these villages.

The leadership of the Armenian SSR Internal Affairs Ministry and the inhabitants of Getashen village appealed to the leadership of Khanlarskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan SSR on 7 March 1990 and to Colonel-General Yuriy Shatalin, chief of the troops of the Internal Affairs Ministry, to avoid conflicts and not settle Azerbaijanis in these villages until these complaints are examined by the USSR Procuracy.

However, on 8 March, just a day after Comrade Shatalin made a promise regarding this issue, the Kamo village was settled with Azerbaijanis, after troops forcibly removed the remaining Armenian families.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is of the opinion that the shaky peace established between Armenia and Azerbaijan should have been utilized to search for ways out of the crisis brought about by the massacres in Baku in January. Instead, after the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal to the leadership and peoples of the two republics to enter into a dialogue, the highest representatives of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry in collusion with the Azerbaijanian authorities and with the assistance of the troops of the Internal Affairs Ministry, completed the enforced eviction of the peaceful population of the aforesaid villages, thus endangering the possibility for normalization the situation in Transcaucasia.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR people's deputies from the Armenian SSR have appealed many times to the USSR Supreme Soviet about the need to ensure the security and the constitutional rights of the Armenian inhabitants of Khanlarskiy rayon in Azerbaijan SSR. No practical measures have yet been taken.

This confirms that influential circles within the country's leadership are not concerned about the worsening situation in Transcaucasia. The situation cannot be normalized unless these criminal acts are stopped.

We are standing on the threshold of an interethnic war. Under the present conditions, the only way to prevent it from happening is the immediate suspension of settlement of these villages by Azerbaijanis and the transfer of Getashen subrayon to Shaumyanovskiy Rayon. Otherwise, the full responsibility for the unforeseeable consequences rests with the country's central authorities.